about how you hold someone accountable and how those testing standards are going to be implemented and whether this could lead to a monopoly test that would in effect become a national test.

We have worked for weeks to try to clarify this language, and I believe by having an alternative available to the States, in addition to their State test, which is to be primary, in addition to the protections that we have for home schools and private schools and public schools that do not receive, if there are any, Federal funds, public schools that do not receive Federal funds, they are not covered by this. We have tried to make sure that the tests cannot be released on any basis without parental approval, that the language is clear to parents, that it is posted.

We still have a few things we are continuing to work through, but there has been great progress in addressing many of the conservative concerns about a national test that we had under the previous administration.

□ 1500

A second area of discussion has been the safe and drug-free schools. I believe that this prevention program, the only prevention program oriented directly at school-age children, needs to preserve its separate funding stream. The President of the United States supports this, the United States Senate supports this, and I believe that the House should support this as well.

It is not a separate funding stream in this bill, although all of the changes that we had suggested and worked with in drug-free schools to make it a more effective program are in this bill. We worked hard in the last session of Congress to try to improve that program. I believe we made great progress. I believe that an amendment that I and others will offer in the committee will address the funding stream question and probably pass very easily and, if not, it will be addressed in the appropriations bill, as it has been in the past.

Because we cannot talk about aid to Colombia and the Andean region that is line item and specific, it is not block granted. We cannot talk about anti-drug efforts in the Justice Department that are not block granted but line-itemed and then say, with prevention and treatment we are going to block grant it with other programs. We need to have drug-free prevention programs in this country that are effective, and I think most Members of Congress, if not the overwhelming majority, quite possibly unanimously, would favor that position.

The third area is that the education bill is the first actual piece of legislation that also addresses the charitable-choice question. We worked this through committee last year in ESEA and it is in the 21st century. It is not a part of a school day, it has to deal with after-school programs. Those who want to get copies of this bill, in the language we can see language that we worked through that is tighter than the language on the welfare bill, tighter than the language on drug treatment, because in these programs, students do not have a choice, there is just one after-school program in their area.

So we have said that not only can government funds not be used to proselytize, but private funds cannot be used for proselytization either during the period that government funds are in it. Because when we have a choice and we can do to different programs, no government funds can ever be used for proselytization, but private funds could be. But when there is only one choice available to students, we have to be even more protective of religious liberty. I believe that we will see in the 21st century a model of how charitable choice can work in those areas which is slightly different than how it will work in other bills.

So today's H.R. 1 is historic because not only is it the first big step in President Bush's ''Leave No Child Behind'' in education, it is also the real first step of actual legislation introduced with specifics on charitable choice.

EDUCATION IN AMERICA TODAY MEANS A CRUSADE FOR OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we might call today kind of opportunity day, since today is the day that the Republican majority introduced their bill on education reform that has been long awaited. The bill introduced by the Republican majority is the administration's bill. We have all waited for this great education initiative which responds to the fact that the American people have, over the last 5 years, consistently said that education is a priority; they would like to see government do more in the area of education. They would like to see every level of government, but they particularly would like to see the Federal Government, do more to help improve education. So the Republican bill was introduced today. I have not seen the details of the bill, but we, of course, have had for several weeks the outline that the administration issued very early this year. That outline talks about focusing on failing schools and targeting Federal resources so that most of the Federal resources go to the most disadvantaged students in these failing schools.

Now that was introduced formally as a bill today. At the same time, we introduced a 21st century higher education initiative today from the Democratic side of the aisle. The Democratic Caucus, under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), we have fashioned a bill which we call the 21st Century Higher Education Initiative. And that bill was discussed at great length today at a press conference.

We held a press conference today and we talked about the bill today, in particular, because today is the 2nd day of a very important conference being held here in the City of Washington, D.C., the National Association for Equal Opportunity, NAEO, which represents Historically Black Colleges and Universities, predominantly black colleges and universities, and is holding their annual conference this weekend. It will go on until this Friday.

Mr. Speaker, among the colleges represented by NAEO are 118 Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and those institutions have been the subject of some controversy over the last few weeks in that the Committee on Education and the Workforce where I serve as a member chose to place all minority colleges, both the three categories of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and the tribally controlled colleges were all placed in a subcommittee away from the core of the higher education concerns. We have resolved that dispute. And I do not want to go into it in any great detail, but I think it is relevant, because as we focus today on the introduction of the administration's education reform bill and the introduction of the democratic initiative called the 21st Century Higher Education Initiative, it is important to place in perspective the role that those institutions can play. They can play a great role in education reform.

Historically Black Colleges and Universities are only a tiny part of the larger constellation of higher education institutions in America. There must be about 3,000, more than 3,000 overall higher education institutions in America, and the 118 Historically Black Colleges and Universities constitute a very tiny segment of that constellation. Even if we add the Hispanic-serving institutions which are defined as institutions which have at least 25 percent of their student body as Hispanics, and we have the tribally controlled colleges, which are the colleges which serve native Americans, we still have a relatively small number of institutions, minority-focused institutions in the larger constellation of higher education institutions.

Of course, most of the African Americans now in America are attending colleges that are not Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Larger numbers are out there in the various State universities and the private colleges because discrimination, which is the reason the Historically Black Colleges and Universities were created, has greatly lessened. In fact, that kind of blatant discrimination which cut off opportunities completely from African-

American students has ceased. That is not the problem anymore.

The reason these institutions are important and should continue to exist is because they do have a special mission. Whereas the mission before was to serve those that could get no decent service anywhere else, or those that needed particular kinds of nurturing, the purpose, the mission still remains. They do not need nurturing because they cannot get into other colleges and universities as a result of racial discrimination, no, that is not the problem; they need nurturing because large numbers of these students are poor. Large numbers of these students need opportunity. They have backgrounds that did not prepare them as well as they should have been prepared for other institutions, and they need the nurturing and the guidance and the counseling and the special focus of concern that they may receive in minority-serving institutions.

So the opportunity is where we should be focused now. We ought to look upon ourselves as being a society which is engaged in a crusade for opportunity, a crusade for opportunity. We have had a lot of debates and we will continue to have debates about race and the role that race plays in terms of opportunity and opening doors and allowing people to fully develop themselves. That debate will still go on. However, we could minimize that debate, or almost make it irrelevant, if we focus on opportunity and say, regardless of what one's race or color or creed, we want to maximize in this society the amount of opportunity that we have. We want to maximize opportunity for all individuals because it is good and in harmony with our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence. For the right to pursue happiness, the implication is that we will not only guarantee the right to pursue happiness, but we will encourage the conditions to pursue happiness, and one of the conditions of the pursuit of happiness is that one has to have the opportunity to develop and be able to, first of all, survive by earning a living, and secondly, to earn enough to be able to improve quality of life.

So if we rally under the flag of opportunity, then we will solve a lot of problems, avoid a lot of controversies, and we could carry this administration, this next 2 years of the 107th Congress, carry it forward nobly into a set of bipartisan activities that would do us all proud. It would be very uplifting for the entire country, it would certainly stoke the spirits of the Members of Congress if we could really tackle the education issue and come out of it with a bipartisan bill and bipartisan program that carries our Nation forward educationally. That would be highly desirable.

So the introduction of these two pieces of legislation related to education is a good jump-off point. We are more serious about it now. Let me just backtrack and say that whereas the administration introduced their bill today for education reform, we had already as Democrats introduced a bill earlier.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and the rest of the Democratic members on the committee, introduced a bill which would accomplish the same kind of education reform which the Republican majority bill introduced today is proposing to accomplish. Our bill, we should note, did not hesitate to make resources available. We are talking about $105 billion over a 5-year period in the legislation that the Democrats introduced, which is going to be one of those major differences between the administration's bill and the administration's approach and the Democratic minority's approach.

We must approach the opportunity ethic and the opportunity crusade that is needed to bring the country to the point where we want to bring it where every citizen can be educated, has a maximum opportunity to be educated, can make their own contribution to our society in an era of great global competitiveness; every citizen can carry their own weight; every citizen can help us maintain our leadership economically, militarily because they are educated and the requirements of this particular complex society are that one has a maximum number of educated people.

Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important no greater resource can any Nation have than to have an educated populous. But as we approach the provision of opportunity for all, we cannot leave out certain areas that are directly impacting upon that opportunity. It is not by accident that the education function, the jurisdiction for education programs is also coupled with the jurisdiction for all programs related to working families and the workplace and the acquisition of income. The Committee on Education and the Workforce used to be called, was called for a long time, most of the history of this Congress, the Education and Labor Committee. It was clearly understood that education and labor went together, were inseparable.

One of the things we must do in improving the workforce is to make certain that they all get a decent education. One of the ways we improve the lives of working families is to make certain that they are in a position to have their children educated without unnecessary strain. If families have to pay enormous tuitions, if they have to move about in search of good schools regardless of other kinds of factors that may exist in the economy, then they are saddled with great hardship that should not be.

So we must be concerned as we look at an approach which would maximize opportunity with the total set of conditions that are in our economy and society that government has an impact on. Government has a duty, government has the authority, government has the responsibility to create an atmosphere where the pursuit of happiness is a possibility.

□ 1515

They have the responsibility to create an atmosphere where the pursuit of happiness is a possibility, where the pursuit of an education is a possibility, where the ability of families and individuals in those families to take advantage of opportunities that are provided for education are increased.

This increase is greatly facilitated if the income of the families improve. The best way to help poor people, the best way to help poor families is to make sure the amount of money that they have is increased. There are a number of ways that have been proposed in terms of fighting poverty, but the best way to fight poverty is to get some more dollars into the hands of working families so that they can spend those dollars in a way to help them pursue happiness and to pursue opportunity.

We cannot have an education policy, we cannot go forward with the educational reform and totally ignore the conditions under which the large majority of the people we are targeting live and work.

President Bush is targeting his program to innercity communities, rural communities, places where there are disadvantaged children, places where there are failing schools. The correlation between poverty and disadvantaged children and failing is very clear. That correlation with poverty is very clear.

Failing, poverty and disadvantaged go together. We have recognized this for quite a while in our legislation. We have a Title I program, which is a primary program which serves poor students; and Title I is based upon a laser beam being focused on the poorest areas and attempting to provide Federal aid in the areas where the poorest students attend schools.

We are identifying those poor students with another Federal program, students who are eligible to receive free lunches. Free lunches are provided by the Department of Agriculture. It is under the auspices of the United States Department of Agriculture, a Federal program that has a longstanding history of success.

So we identify the worthy recipients of our education funds by those who qualify for the free lunch programs. Poverty and the need to provide opportunity enhanced by Federal dollars is closely correlated. There is no argument about this. Everybody concedes that there is a close correlation between poverty and lack of opportunity, poverty and disadvantaged status. So let us, as we address the education issue, look at the larger education workforce issues.

Look at the fact that we have not passed an increase in the minimum wage. The 106th Congress got close to

it at one point, but we did not bring it to the floor. There was no increase in the minimum wage, even a minimum increase in the minimum wage. I do call it a minimum increase, because all we were proposing was a 50 cent increase in the minimum wage per year over a 2-year period. That would have brought the minimum wage up to 6.15 from the 5.15, and we did not do that. The minimum wage at this point is at the level of 5.15 per hour.

There are some other mechanisms that relate to the Fair Labor Standards Act and other responsibilities under the Department of Labor related to improving income which also have not been activated. Most people do not know or understand the regulations related to the H–2A program, H–2A temporary foreign agricultural worker program.

Mr. Speaker, the H–2A foreign agricultural worker program is a complicated program designed to stop illegal immigration into the country, exploitation of immigrants, and that has worked in many ways in terms of an orderly flow of immigrants into the country into the farm areas where large numbers of farm workers were needed.

One of the provisions in that legislation and one of the provisions presently existing in the law is a requirement that a survey be made of the prevailing wages in the area, something similar to Davis-Bacon for construction, across this country. But in order not to undercut farm laborers who already are in the country, citizens of the Nation who are working in the farm areas, farm workers who are not immigrants, in order not to undercut them, this law requires that there be a survey made of the area, and you reach some kind of level of identifying a prevailing wage for farm area workers.

All of the temporary foreign agricultural worker programs must then pay that wage. It varies from one area to another. But sometimes there is a considerable amount of substance between what the farm area workers are earning and what the imported immigrants are paid. But, by law, they must pay this wage that is established as a result of the survey.

We were deeply concerned with the fact that each year they issued the tables and they published the statistics and the determinations of what this wage rate should be and, as a result of that publication, the workers in those areas are eligible for, and should be paid, according to the new calculations, the new wage rates.

We were concerned that this is a routine matter, a ministerial function of the Department of Labor. It does not take much to get out a letter which says that the survey has been conducted, State-by-State. Here are the figures, and here is the table for this year.

Mr. Speaker, that has been done pretty routinely in the past, and we were shocked to find that it did not happen with this new administration.

We wrote to the Department of Labor Secretary, Secretary of Labor Elaine L. Chao, in February of this year, February 28, because usually very early in February these tables for the new wage rates are issued. They were not issued.

We wrote a letter to her, and I am going to read that letter and enter it into the record, so that you will see what the problem is.

What are we talking about? We are talking about income for people at the very bottom of the scale, income for migrant farm workers. But more importantly are, or just as important as the income of these workers, is the standard that is upheld. You do not undercut the farmer workers who are already there.

Though farm workers who are already working, making very low wages, should not have their wages undercut by immigrant farmer workers who come in and are paid less are exploited. That is the reason why we insist that there be a survey made, an establishment of a prevailing wage. And once the prevailing wage is established, you must pay the immigrant workers at that level so you do not undercut the labor standards and the labor standard of living of the workers in that area.

So we wrote to Secretary Chao, ''We are deeply concerned that the Department of Labor has not performed the simple annual clerical duty, as required under current regulation, to publish in the Federal Register the adverse effect wage rates applicable to farm workers and employers under the H–2A temporary foreign agriculture foreign worker program. Ordinarily, the wage rates are issued in early to mid-February; however, the wage rates have not been issued yet.

''Department of Labor's responsibility in issuing the wage rates is ministerial. The Department of Labor merely publishes the State-by-State results of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's regional surveys of the average hourly wage rates for field and livestock workers. This information has already been given to the Department of Labor.''

They had the information that was empowered from the surveys.

Continuing to read in the letter to Secretary Elaine Chao dated February 28, ''Failure to publish the new wage rates in the Federal Register apparently means that they will not take effect. Consequently, employers can pay farm workers last year's adverse effect wage rates, most of which are significantly lower than they would be if the new wage rates were published.

''Although many farm workers are affected by the H–2A program have not yet begun their seasons, in Florida, for example, there are ongoing seasons and there are H–2A companies operating at this time of the year. Florida's H–2A AEWR was $7.25 per hour for the year 2000.''

This year it is supposed to be increased to $7.66 an hour, and it has not taken effect. They also give an example for Georgia.

Continuing in the letter to Elaine Chao, ''The DOL, the Department of Labor, cites the moratorium on regulations as the reason for its failure to publish. This is absurd, since the DOL's act of publishing in the Federal Register the survey results'' would be really of publishing the survey results which ''already obtained from the USDA would not be a new regulation. The current regulation, issued in 1987, directs DOL to publish these wage rates in a timely manner and the failure to do so violates the regulation.

''We strongly urge you to take prompt action to publish the adverse effect wage rates under the H–2A program in order to carry out the Department's obligation to protect U.S. farm workers and foreign workers from being subjected to wage rates that undermine labor standards in American agriculture.

''Please let us know when we can expect DOL to carry out its obligations under the law.''

This letter is signed by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. Speaker, I want to include for the RECORD the letter to Elaine Chao as aforementioned:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Washington, DC, February 28, 2001.

Hon. ELAINE L. CHAO,
Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY CHAO: We are deeply concerned that the Department of Labor (DOL) has not performed the simple annual clerical duty, as required under current regulation (20 CFR 655.107), to publish in the Federal Register the adverse effect wage rates applicable to farmworkers and employers under the H–2A temporary foreign agricultural worker program. Ordinarily, the wage rates are issued in early to mid-February; however, the wage rates have not been issued yet.

DOL's responsibility in issuing the wage rates is ministerial. The Department of Labor merely publishes the state-by-state results of the US Department of Agriculture's (USDA) regional surveys of the average hourly wage rates for field and livestock workers (combined). This information has already been given to DOL.

Failure to publish the new wage rates in the Federal Register apparently means that they will not take effect. Consequently, employers can pay farmworkers last year's adverse effect wage rates, most of which are significantly lower than they would be if the new wage rates were published.

Although many farmworkers affected by the H–2A program have not yet begun their seasons, in Florida for example, there are ongoing seasons and there are H–2A companies operating at this time of the year. Florida's H–2A AEWR was $7.25 per hour for the year 2000. The Florida AEWR is supposed to increase to $7.66 per hour for 2001. In Georgia, where most work has not started yet, the H–2A AEWR is supposed to increase by 11 cents per hour to $6.83. These changes may be small but they are extremely important to the farmworkers who earn these low wage rates.

The DOL cites the moratorium on regulations as the reason for its failure to publish.

This is absurd, since the DOL's act of publishing in the Federal Register the survey results already obtained from the USDA would not be a new regulation. The current regulation, issued in 1987, directs DOL to publish these wage rates in a timely manner and the failure to do so violates the regulation.

We strongly urge you to take prompt action to publish the adverse effect wage rates under the H–2A program in order to carry out the Department's obligation to protect U.S. farm workers and foreign workers from being subjected to wage rates that undermine labor standards in American agriculture.

Please let us know when we can expect DOL to carry out its obligations under the law.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER.
MAJOR OWENS.
HOWARD L. BERMAN.

Mr. Speaker, the response from Secretary Chao came on March 16.

Dear Congressman Miller, thank you for your and your colleagues' letter expressing concerns regarding the Department's publication of the Adverse Effects Wage Rates as required under the 20 CFR 655.107. I share your concerns about U.S. farm workers and U.S. farmers.

Staff have provided me with an initial briefing on the issues surrounding the AEWR. As a result, I have learned that concerns have been raised about the fairness and accuracy of the methodology used to compute the AEWR. In keeping with the spirit of the memorandum from the Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff entitled, Regulatory Review Plan, the announcement of the 2001 AEWR is delayed for 60 days while I review the issues in preparation for a decision.

I have instructed staff to further investigate the concerns that have been raised about the methodology used to compute the rates to assist me in becoming more familiar with the issue. I will be pleased to advise you when final action has been taken.

I hope the information above is responsive to your concern. Sincerely, Secretary Elaine L. Chao.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the response from Secretary Chao:

SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Washington, March 16, 2001.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: Thank you for your and your colleagues' letter expressing concerns regarding the Department's publication of the Adverse Effect Wage Rates (AEWR) as required under 20 CFR 655.107. I share your concerns about U.S. farm workers and U.S. farmers.

Staff have provided me with an initial briefing on the issues surrounding the AEWR. As a result, I have learned that concerns have been raised about the fairness and accuracy of the methodology used to compute the AEWR. In keeping with the spirit of the memorandum from the Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff entitled, ''Regulatory Review Plan,'' the announcement of the 2001 AEWR is delayed for 60 days while I review the issues in preparation for a decision.

I have instructed staff to further investigate the concerns that have been raised about the methodology used to compute the rates to assist me in becoming more familiar with the issue. I will be pleased to advise you when final action has been taken.

I hope the information above is responsive to your concerns.

Sincerely,

ELAINE L. CHAO.

Mr. Speaker, I think that any high school student and sophomore can see one of the problems here are the regulations were supposed to be issued in early February. They were not issued; and, therefore, we wrote a letter to the Department of Labor Secretary. And now she is telling us in March that she is putting it on hold for 60 days in order to review it.

The reason given for reviewing that is that the President's staff has issued a statement that there should be no new regulations until they are reviewed. This is not a new regulation. This is a simple computation that was mandated by an old regulation. This is a simple matter of issuing a statement based on what the law already has dictated should be done so that workers out there earning minimum wages in the farm sector will not have to wait for 60 days from March 16.

She did not really say she has given herself a deadline. It is a vague 60 days. Mr. Speaker, March 16 is already 2 months late in issuing these standards, another 60 days, and it may go on to June, and a half year will go by.

What does a half year mean to a farm worker? In the case of New York, the regulations say that, instead of being paid 7.68 an hour, as they are now, the new prevailing wage rates show that they should be paid 8.17 an hour, close to 50 cents more for a 40-hour week. Fifty cents more means that you got $20 more in your pay. For a whole 6 months, a half year, that is 20 times all those weeks.

My colleagues might say that still is chicken feed, chump change, not much money, but for a worker who is earning $7 an hour, that is important money for his family. Why should we deprive them of 50 cents an hour because there is this kind of lethargy and laziness?

Mr. Speaker, I hope there is nothing more sinister than that in the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor ought to go ahead and issue the standards. The table is right here. It is already compiled. It is available for every State. California moves from $7.27 an hour to $7.56 an hour, Florida from $7.25 an hour to $7.60 an hour. On and on it goes, with increases I think being as high as 50 cents an hour that workers would be getting.

□ 1530

That is workers who are foreign workers coming in. It is also workers who already here would be paid at the same level. In fact, their payment at that level is already established. That is how one arrives at these figures.

So if one cares about opportunity, if one cares about education at the elementary, secondary school level, if one cares about education at the higher education level, then one of the first things one wants to do is make certain that families have decent incomes; that they are in a position to send their kids to school with a decent meal in their stomachs, and that they are able to support the atmosphere needed, stable homes for the youngsters when they return.

One cannot separate out the responsibility of the government to maintain in this complex society of ours some kind of justice with respect to wages and say that one cares about education and opportunity.

Opportunity has to come with a recognition that the basic problem in this Nation is poverty. The basic education problem is the poverty of the families. The correlation between poverty and failing schools, between poverty and failing students is overwhelming and clearly established.

I cite workers who are farm workers, but do not forget the fact I started by saying we refused to increase the minimum wage from $5.15 an hour to $6.15 over a 2-year period. So we are looking at families in America saying that, you know, you can wait. The dollar increase that we proposed 2 years ago, which would raise the salaries by now to $6.15 an hour are not in motion. Last year's Congress did not act on it. It is not on the agenda for this year.

So are we interested in enhancing opportunity for all in America? Forget about race, color, creed. Let us focus on a crusade for opportunity. Provide opportunity for everybody, and that way we solve a lot of different problems. In the provision of opportunity, do not overlook the conditions that working families live under and the fact that they have to have decent incomes.

In the area of migrant workers, for example, for my colleagues' information, there are an estimated 1.6 million migrant or seasonal farm workers working in the fields, the orchards, the greenhouses, the nurseries, and the ranches of America. But this does not include those who work in meat-packing plants and livestock assemblies.

One thing we could say is that we in Congress are examining requests for new programs to ensure that agricultural businesses remain in business. Traditionally, it has been the grains, soybeans and other capital-intensive crops that have relied on subsidies and government assistance.

We taxpayers have paid subsidies for some of these same crops these farm workers are gathering. The way we are doing it now helps to eliminate the subsidies necessary to be paid by the government.

The growers of fruits, vegetables, and other labor-intensive crop growers have not received subsidies. Produce growers have benefited from international trade agreements and Americans' greater interest in eating fruits and vegetables for health reasons. But fruit and vegetable growers more and more are asking for additional government assistance.

As we consider expanding assistance to agricultural businesses in the upcoming farm bill, we should look at

how those employees in those businesses are doing. The evidence is that agriculture workers are not doing well. In fact, as the fruit and vegetable industry has expanded its imports dramatically, U.S. farm workers have gotten poorer.

The National Agricultural Workers Survey of the Department of Labor profiles characteristics of crop workers and their jobs. This is Report Number 8 in a series of publications based on the findings of the National Agricultural Worker Survey, a nationwide random survey on the demographic and employment characteristics of hired crop workers.

This report, like those before it, finds that several long-standing trends characterizing the farm-labor work force and the farm-labor market are continuing. It finds that farm-worker wages have stagnated, annual earnings remain below the poverty level, farm workers experience chronic underemployment, and that the farm work force increasingly consists of young single males who are recent immigrants.

Their findings of low wages, underemployment and low annual incomes of U.S. crop workers are indicative of a national oversupply of farm labor. Low annual income, in turn, most likely contributes to the instability that characterizes the agricultural labor market, as farm workers seek jobs paying higher wages and offering more hours of work.

Over the period of the 1990s, with a strong economy and greater, increasingly widespread prosperity, farm-worker wages have still lost ground relative to those workers in private, nonfarm jobs. Since 1989, the average nominal hourly wage of farm workers has risen by only 18 percent, about one-half of the 32 percent increase for nonagricultural farm workers.

Adjusted for inflation, the real hourly wage of farm workers has dropped from $6.89 to $6.18. If just for the fact that the cost of doing business in this society has gone up, farm workers are really going backwards in terms of their minimum wage.

Consequently, farm workers have lost 11 percent of their purchasing power over the last decade. For the past decade, the median income of individual farm workers has remained less than $7,500 per year while that of farm-worker families has remained less than $10,000 a year. A farm-worker family, four people have to live on $10,000 per year.

The majority of the farm workers had incomes below the poverty level in America. Despite the fact that the relative poverty of farm workers and their families has grown, their use of social services remains low; and for some programs, their use of social services has even declined.

In 1997, 1998, most farm workers, about 60 percent, held only one farm job per year. The majority had learned about their current job through informal means, such as through a friend, a relative or a workmate. On average, farm workers were employed in agriculture for less than half a year. Even in July, when demand for farm labor peaks in many parts of the country, just over half of the total farm-labor work force held agriculture jobs. On average, farm workers supplemented their agricultural earnings with 5 weeks of nonfarm employment.

The number of weeks this work force is employed each year in farm and nonfarm jobs in the U.S. has been declining.

In every way, these people on the very bottom of the labor wage scale, have been going backwards. I cite farm workers only as one example because they happen to fall under the purview of the committee where I serve as the ranking Democrat.

The Subcommittee on Workforce Protections is responsible for minimum wage. The minimum wage of all workers in America is established by the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Fair Labor Standards Act requires action by Congress, and Congress failed in the 106th Congress last year to raise the minimum wage by a measly $1 over 2 years.

We are now saying that we want to maximize the opportunity with education in our society. We want to really do something about the reform of elementary and secondary education.

How can we accomplish reform in elementary and secondary education? How can we improve opportunity in higher education when we are acting with contempt on the very basic issue of income for American families? One cannot separate out the issue of education from the issue of security and the nurturing of the family. All of it must go together.

I started before by saying that today is a great day, because today we introduced the President's education initiative in the form of a bill. We always had his outline before. Now we have a bill. The President has introduced his education initiative for elementary and secondary education.

At the same time, the Democrats introduced a bill called the 21st Century Higher Education Initiative, where we are moving to improve higher-education opportunities for minorities, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, the tribally controlled colleges, and the Hispanic-serving institutions.

I think it is important that it all happened today. I wanted to take note of that here and say that, if there is anything, nothing would be more pleasing to both sides of the aisle than we should come out of this 107th Congress with a meaningful education-reform bill, an education-reform bill that really carries us forward beyond the rhetoric that has been going on for the last few years.

Everybody talks about education in the Congress, but very little has been done about it in the last few years. Everybody talks about education. The American people have listed education as being our number one priority for the last 5 years.

But we still have schools out there which are crumbling. We still need, according to the survey done by the National Education Association, we need $320 billion for repairs and modernization and the construction of new schools, new public schools. $320 billion is needed across the Nation for the modernization, construction, and repair of schools.

We have been talking about it now for the last 5 years, but the Federal Government did not appropriate a single penny for construction until the last session. In the last days of the last session in December, President Clinton was able to hold out and finally get an appropriation of $1.2 billion for school repairs, a mere $1.2 billion compared to the need that was established by the National Education Association, which says we need, over the next 10 years, about $320 billion. But at least the 1.2, it broke the barrier. We had never had, for the last 50 years, never had Federal legislation on school construction. We have broken the barrier. $1.2 billion is available.

Now the rumor is that the present administration that has come in refuses to spend the $1.2 billion on school repairs. We are going to have to fight about money that has already been appropriated by the last Congress before we move on to improve education in this Congress.

I hope that the rumor and the stated intentions of administration are not true as stated. They are refusing to spend money for school construction. No improvement of education can go forward.

I have seen the outline of the President's bill. They want to focus on schools that need help most, in the areas where we have the poorest population. There is a correlation there. In the inner-city communities and in the rural communities, we have the worst buildings, the worst physical facilities.

Most children and adults who live in suburban areas and go to modern up-to-date schools have no idea what I am talking about. They cannot envision a school which has a coal-burning furnace. Still in America, we have schools, certainly in New York City, we have schools that are still burning coal in their furnace.

What does it mean to burn coal in the school furnace? It means that there is inevitable pollution that is taking place day by day. The children are being subjected each day to unnecessary pollutants.

When I first bought a house years ago, I could not afford anything else, I bought a house that had a coal-burning furnace. The house, we put filters on; and we did everything possible to minimize the amount of coal dust that circulated in the house.

No matter what precautions one takes, if one has a coal-burning furnace

in the building, the tiny particles of coal are going to seep through. If one has small children, they are going to be jeopardized because the lungs of small children are more susceptible. And certainly, please, do not have a child who already is disposed to asthma.

The asthma rate in New York City is very high. We can find the highest rates of asthma among children in the areas where we have schools that have coal-burning furnaces.

The correlation, again, is overwhelming. So it is hard for most people to visualize that we have schools that are still burning coal in their furnace.

I suppose it is also hard to visualize the fact that, in New York City, most of the school buildings are more than 50 years old. The life of a brick building at one time they said is about 50 years. All of our schools are more than 50 years old just about. Maybe about 15 percent are not that old; but the rest of them, more than 50 years old. Then about 25 percent of the schools are almost 100 years old. The buildings are almost 100 years old.

So if one is going to improve education, whether one follows the Republican majority plan or one follows the Democratic initiative that was introduced earlier in the year, either one requires that one does something about the physical condition of the schools.

□ 1545

How do we convince young people we really care about education if we are forcing them to attend school in a building that has a coal-burning furnace? We cannot convince children that we are interested in really improving education if we are forcing them to attend school in a school building that is so overcrowded because it has so many more pupils than it was built for.

We have some schools in my district built for 500 pupils and they now serve 1,100. They are serving 1,100 children in a building built for 500. More than twice the number of children that the building was built for. As a result, the lunchroom cannot hold all the youngsters, of course. They have to eat in three or four cycles. The first cycle in the school begins at 10 o'clock.

In other words, a certain group of children, one-third, are told that they have to eat lunch at 10 o'clock. Now, they have just had breakfast, but they have to eat lunch at 10 o'clock. The other group, the final third, will be eating late, after 1 o'clock. So they will be hungry. The first group is being forced to eat when they are not hungry.

Those kinds of conditions exist in too many of our schools, where they start eating lunch early because the cycle has to be completed for three or four different cycles because the building is too small, the cafeteria is too small. It was not built for those kinds of students.

We have situations where we have trailers, trailers in the school yards. And this is something that is not common to big city schools. All over the country one of the problems with rural schools is they have a lot of trailers out there too that were temporary. Trailers are temporary constructs. They are not built to last 20 years. One of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), says she went to visit her old junior high school that she had attended and the trailers that were there temporarily when she was in that junior high school were still there. And we know that across the country we have trailers in the schoolyards and they stay there forever.

Are we going to convince a student or the teachers that we are serious about improving education if we do nothing about these physical conditions that exist at present? If we do nothing about the fact that large numbers of schools do not have trained and certified teachers, are we going to be able to convince the youngsters or the teachers or parents that we seriously care about schools? So dollars are going to be necessary in order to fulfill the rhetoric and the plans and the vision statements that have been made about education.

We also have to recognize the complexities of the situation. Although the President is focusing and the administration bill focuses on elementary and secondary education, and we are not scheduled to revise the Higher Education Assistance Act until next year, we must move across all fronts at the same time. Higher education cannot be separated from elementary and secondary education if we want to improve the schools.

After we get past the very serious problem of physical infrastructure, the biggest problem that schools have now is qualified personnel, qualified teachers, teachers who are trained, educated properly. Teachers who are certified.

In some cases, we have certified teachers who are teaching subjects that they are not certified to teach. A few years ago, in central Brooklyn and other parts of New York serving mostly Hispanic and black students, they made a survey and they found that most of the teachers who were teaching math and science in the junior high schools had not majored in math and science in college. They were certified teachers, but they were certified in some other area.

Well, that is better than the situation that existed in a lot of elementary schools in one segment of my district. In New York City, the total city is divided up into 32 school districts. One of the school districts in my congressional district, district 23, year before last had a situation where one-half of their teachers were substitute teachers all year long. They were not certified, and they were not regular. So the students in that district were constantly being subjected to changing teachers every day. One-half of them were in that kind of situation.

Is it any wonder that there was a drop in the reading level scores in that district, or that for years that district has had the notoriety of being on the very bottom for the whole 32 school districts in the city? They have gone up in the last couple of years as a result of paying attention to this problem and many others. But the problem of certified teachers is a problem that we must tackle head on. We will have no improvement in education unless the teachers and administrators and principals are all well trained.

An initiative in higher education, colleges and universities, allows us to train teachers, to get those certified teachers into the classrooms, to improve the supply of teachers, and to be able to meet the number one requirement of education improvement. For that reason, I am proud of the fact that, along with my Democratic colleagues, we introduced an initiative today which relates to higher education, and we expect that to have an impact on education in general.

With great pleasure, I join my Democratic colleagues today to introduce the 21st Century Higher Education Initiative. Since 1837, Historically Black Colleges and Universities have played a vital role in producing this Nation's most influential African-American leaders; people such as Martin Luther King, Jr., Thurgood Marshall, Oprah Winfrey, Barbara Jordan, and Langston Hughes, all graduates of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and they have inspired a generation of young people of all races.

Today, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and other minority-serving institutions, are continuing to produce highly qualified students that fill key positions in the public and private sector. For instance, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities are now responsible for producing 28 percent of all bachelor's degrees and 15 percent of all master's degrees earned by African Americans. While these numbers are encouraging, more must be done to ensure that minority students are not locked out of the higher education debate.

The 21st Century Higher Education Initiative more than doubles funding for title III and title V and increases the maximum Pell Grant award from $3,750 to $7,000 over a 3-year-period. Increasing funding for title III and title V will close the funding gap between minority- and nonminority-serving institutions. Increasing the maximum Pell Grant award will make the burden of paying for college easier for poor minority students who cannot afford to attend college.

The 21st Century Education Initiative also includes dramatic increases for supplemental equal opportunity grants and Federal work study by increasing each program by $300 million over the next 3 years. Both programs play a critical role in the lives of students who are often the first person in their family to attend college.

Also included are increases for TRIO and GEAR-UP, which encourage minority students from underserved communities to attend college. TRIO and GEAR-UP have a long track record of preparing minority students for college through academic enrichment and mentorship activities.

The bill also includes funding to preserve buildings on the National Register of Historic Places by authorizing $60 million a year for facilities most in need of repair on the campuses of Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

In addition, the bill addresses the critical needs for qualified minority teachers by authorizing $30 million for a new program that will strengthen teacher preparation programs at minority-serving institutions. The 21st Century Higher Education Initiative also takes into account reports from the National Telecommunications & Information Administration and the Benton Foundation regarding the Digital Divide. The initiative would create a $250 million program based on proposals by Senator CLELAND and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) that will provide equipment, wire campuses, and train students for careers in technology.

Providing increased funding for technology at HBCUs will ensure that young African-American students are given every opportunity to compete on a level playing field.

In closing, the Democratic party has sent a clear signal to Members of the House and the Senate, educating minority students from underserved communities is at the top of our agenda. We look forward to working with our colleagues from across the aisle and the administration in passing legislation that ''leaves no child behind.''

Increasing funding for HBCUs, HSIs, and TCCs will not only benefit the minority community but provide our Nation with experienced and talented young people who are prepared to compete in today's global workforce.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting that we bring it all together. Let us make this year of 2001 the first year of the 107th Congress, the first year of a new administration, a year where we achieve one outstanding, glowing, bipartisan accomplishment, and that is the improvement of education in America.

And as we improve education in America, let us also understand that a part of that requires that we improve opportunities for working families, starting with improving their wages and income.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a chart of wages; a Comparison of H–2A Adverse Effect Wage Rates.

COMPARISON OF H–2A ADVERSE EFFECT WAGE RATES 1997–2000

State	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001 [1]
Alabama	$5.92	$6.30	$6.30	$6.72	$6.83
Arizona	5.82	6.08	6.42	6.74	6.71
Arkansas	5.70	5.98	6.21	6.50	6.69
California	6.53	6.87	7.23	7.27	7.56
Colorado	6.09	6.39	6.73	7.04	7.43
Connecticut	6.71	6.84	7.18	7.68	8.17
Delaware	6.26	6.33	6.84	7.04	7.37
Florida	6.36	6.77	7.13	7.25	7.66
Georgia	5.92	6.30	6.30	6.72	6.83
Hawaii	8.62	8.83	8.97	9.38	9.05
Idaho	6.01	6.54	6.48	6.79	7.26
Illinois	6.66	7.18	7.53	7.62	8.09
Indiana	6.66	7.18	7.53	7.62	8.09
Iowa	6.22	6.86	7.17	7.76	7.84
Kansas	6.55	7.01	7.12	7.49	7.81
Kentucky	5.68	5.92	6.28	6.39	6.60
Louisiana	5.70	5.98	6.21	6.50	6.69
Maine	6.71	6.84	7.18	7.68	8.17
Maryland	6.26	6.33	6.84	7.04	7.37
Massachusetts	6.71	6.84	7.18	7.68	8.17
Michigan	6.56	6.85	7.34	7.65	8.07
Minnesota	6.56	6.85	7.34	7.65	8.07
Mississippi	5.70	5.98	6.21	6.50	6.69
Missouri	6.22	6.86	7.17	7.76	7.84
Montana	6.01	6.54	6.48	6.79	7.26
Nebraska	6.55	7.01	7.12	7.49	7.81
Nevada	6.09	6.39	6.73	7.04	7.43
New Hampshire	6.71	6.84	7.18	7.68	8.17
New Jersey	6.26	6.33	6.84	7.04	7.37
New Mexico	5.82	6.08	6.42	6.74	6.71
New York	6.71	6.84	7.18	7.68	8.17
North Carolina	5.79	6.16	6.54	6.98	7.06
North Dakota	6.55	7.01	7.12	7.49	7.81
Ohio	6.66	7.18	7.53	7.62	8.09
Oklahoma	5.48	5.92	6.25	6.49	6.98
Oregon	6.87	7.08	7.34	7.64	8.14
Pennsylvania	6.26	6.33	6.84	7.04	7.37
Rhode Island	6.71	6.84	7.18	7.68	8.17
South Carolina	5.92	6.30	6.30	6.72	6.83
South Dakota	6.55	7.01	7.12	7.49	7.81
Tennessee	5.68	5.92	6.28	6.39	6.60
Texas	5.48	5.92	6.25	6.49	6.98
Utah	6.09	6.39	6.73	7.04	7.43
Vermont	6.71	6.48	7.18	7.68	8.17
Virginia	5.79	6.16	6.54	6.98	7.06
Washington	6.87	7.08	7.34	7.64	8.14
West Virginia	5.68	5.92	6.28	6.39	6.60
Wisconsin	6.56	6.85	7.34	7.65	8.07
Wyoming	6.01	6.54	6.48	6.79	7.26

[1] Not approved by the Department of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, I also include for the RECORD a statement labeled 21st Century Higher Education Press Conference dated March 22, 2001.

21ST CENTURY HIGHER EDUCATION INITIATIVE

It is with great pleasure that I join my Democratic Colleagues by introducing the ''21st Century Higher Education Initiative.'' Since 1837, Historically Black Colleges and Universities have played a vital role in producing this nations most influential African-American leaders. People such as Martin Luther King, Jr., Thurgood Marshall, Oprah Winfrey, Barbara Jordan and Langston Hughes all graduates of HBCU's have inspired a generation of young people of all races. Today, HBCU's and other minority serving institutions continue to produce highly qualified students that fill key positions in the public and private sector. For instance, HBCU's are now responsible for producing 28 percent of all bachelor's degrees and 15 percent of all master's degrees earned by African-Americans.

While these numbers are encouraging, more must be done to ensure that minority students are not locked out of the higher education debate. The ''21st Century Higher Education Initiative'' more than doubles funding for Title III and Title V and increases the maximum Pell Grant award from $3,750 to $7,000 over three years. Increasing funding for Title III and V will close the funding gap between minority and non-minority serving institutions. Increasing the maximum Pell grant award will make the burden of paying for college easier for poor minority students who can't afford to attend college.

The 21st Century Education Initiative also includes dramatic increases for Supplemental Equal Opportunity Grants (SEOG) and Federal Work Study by increasing each program by $300 million over the next three years. Both programs play a critical role in

lives of students who are often the first person in their family to attend college. Also included in the bill are increases for TRIO and GEAR-UP which encourage minority students from underserved communities to attend college. TRIO and GEAR-UP have a long track record of preparing minority students for college through academic enrichment and mentorship activities.

The bill also includes funding to preserve buildings on the National Register of Historic Places by authorizing $60 million a year for facilities most in need of repair. In addition, the bill addresses the critical need for qualified minority teachers by authorizing $30 million for a new program that will strengthen teacher preparation programs at minority serving institutions. The 21st Century Higher Education Initiative also takes in account reports from the National Telecommunications & Information Administration (NTIA) and the Benton Foundation regarding the Digital Divide. The initiative would create a $250 million program based on proposals by Senator Cleland and Ccongressman Towns that would provide equipment, wire campuses and train students for careers in technology. Providing increased funding for technology at HBCU's will ensure that young African-American students are given every opportunity to compete on a leveled playing field.

In closing, the Democratic party has sent a clear signal to members of the House and Senate, educating minority students from under-served communities is at the top of our agenda. We look forward to working with our colleagues from across the aisle and the Administration in passing legislation that ''leaves no child behind.'' Increasing funding for HBCU's, HSI's and TCC's will not only benefit the minority community but provide our nation with experienced and talented young people who are prepared to compete in today's global workforce.

BREAST CANCER PRESCRIPTION DRUG FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a serious health issue that potentially affects the lives of every woman on Long Island. Breast cancer is the most common form of cancer among women in the United States, and Long Island's breast cancer rates are the highest in the Nation, 20 percent higher than the national average. Today, many lack the coverage for prescription drugs and face severe financial problems in affording the medications they need to defeat this dreadful and horrible disease.

Being diagnosed with breast cancer is a devastating experience for a woman and her family. Yet breast cancer victims on Medicare and those without any coverage have a tough time or simply cannot afford the medications they need. The bipartisan Breast Cancer Prescription Drug Fairness Act that I along, with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), introduced would end that. H.R. 758 aims to make prescription drugs available to Medicare beneficiaries and seeks to allow those without medical coverage to buy into the system. Right now women on Medicare receive their breast cancer medication for $58 a month whereas women without coverage must pay $105 a month. In 1998, 18 percent of all New York women between the ages of 18 and 64 were uninsured. In 2001, approximately 2,200 New York women diagnosed with breast cancer would be uninsured. With 85 percent of breast cancer victims over the age of 55, this bill gives Medicare recipients the purchasing power to buy prescription drugs at a much lower price.

This bill is about saving women's lives. No one fighting breast cancer should have to choose between buying food or the medication that will save their lives. Until a cure for this horrible disease is discovered, we must do all that we can to give breast cancer victims every opportunity to beat this disease.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to join the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and myself as a cosponsor of the Breast Cancer Prescription Drug Fairness Act.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE UNITED STATES GROUP OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928a and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Group of the North Atlantic Assembly:

Mr. DEUTSCH of Florida,
Mr. BORSKI of Pennsylvania,
Mr. LANTOS of California, and
Mr. RUSH of Illinois.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of health reasons.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of illness.

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKELTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LUTHER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REHBERG) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. REHBERG, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HEFLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WAMP, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. NORTHUP, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HYDE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GRUCCI, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 26, 2001, at 2 p.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Aníbal Acevedo-Vilá, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Thomas H. Allen, Robert E. Andrews, Richard K. Armey, Joe Baca, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, John Elias E. Baldacci, Tammy Baldwin, Cass Ballenger, James A. Barcia, Bob Barr, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Ken Bentsen, Doug Bereuter, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Michael Bilirakis, Rod R. Blagojevich, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, Sherwood L. Boehlert, John A. Boehner, Henry Bonilla, David E. Bonior, Mary Bono, Robert A. Borski, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Allen Boyd, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Sherrod Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Ed Bryant, Richard Burr, Dan Burton, Steve Buyer, Sonny Callahan, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, Chris Cannon, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Benjamin L. Cardin, Brad Carson, Julia Carson, Michael N. Castle, Steve Chabot, Saxby Chambliss, Wm. Lacy Clay, Eva M. Clayton, Bob Clement, Howard Coble, Mac Collins, Larry Combest, Gary A. Condit, John Cooksey, Jerry F. Costello, Christopher Cox, William J. Coyne, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Philip M. Crane, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Cubin, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Randy ''Duke'' Cunningham, Danny K. Davis, Jim Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Susan A. Davis, Thomas M. Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Tom DeLay, Jim DeMint, Peter Deutsch, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Calvin M. Dooley, John T. Doolittle, Michael F. Doyle, David Dreier, John J. Duncan, Jr., Jennifer Dunn, Chet Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Robert L. Ehrlich, Jr., Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Phil English, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Lane Evans, Terry Everett, Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Mike Ferguson, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, Ernie Fletcher, Mark Foley, Harold E. Ford, Jr., Vito Fossella, Barney Frank, Rodney P.