the wonderful life he lived. Bill will surely be missed.

RECOGNIZING MR. GUS CHAVEZ

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 30, 2003

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize one of the most inspiring and remarkable Latino leaders in our country, Mr. Gus Chavez. Gus Chavez is a bellwether in higher education and human service. Most importantly, he is an exceptional human being who has dedicated his entire professional life to improving access to higher education for underrepresented minorities in southern California.

For more than 30 years, Mr. Chavez has worked as director of the Offices of Educational Opportunity/Ethnic Affairs and Affirmative Action at San Diego State University. An alumnus of SDSU, Gus Chavez was responsible for recruitment, admission and retention services of low income and educationally disadvantaged students at SDSU. He also assisted and promoted the development of university initiatives aimed at admitting a racially and culturally diversified student body throughout the university.

Under his leadership, EOP/Ethnic Affairs at San Diego State has admitted over 22,000 low-income students in the university. Currently, San Diego State ranks 5th in the nation in awarding Bachelor of Arts degrees to Latino students.

Throughout his illustrious career Mr. Chavez has earned numerous awards for his monumental accomplishments. Some of his awards include the Outstanding MEChA Faculty/Staff Award, the California Educational Opportunity Program Directors Service Award, and the Cesar E. Chavez Award for Social Justice Service. Although many of his awards come from the Latino community, African American and Filipino SDSU students have also recognized him. During his career, he earned the African Student Union Service Award and the Filipino American Council of San Diego County Service Award.

After more than 30 years of serving underrepresented students, Mr. Chavez continues to mentor young people in his retired state. I unwaveringly commend him for his excellent work and for all his remarkable accomplishments.

I am privileged to recognize him as the perfect example of today's exceptional leader.

A SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO DR. LARRY G. MCDOUGLE, PRESIDENT OF NORTHWEST STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 30, 2003

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege to stand before my colleagues in the House to pay tribute to an outstanding educator from Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. Dr. Larry G. McDougle retires today after a distinguished career as the Fourth President of Northwest State Community College (NSCC) in Archbold, Ohio.

Larry McDougle's career in higher education spans more than 3 decades and has touched the lives of students and administrators in fours states. He is the product of Ohio's universities, receiving his bachelor's degree in physics from the University of Findlay (1963), his master's degree in physics from Kent State University (1965), and his doctorate in higher education from the University of Toledo (1971).

During his professional career, Dr. McDougle has served as a faculty member and administrator in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and South Carolina. Prior to his appointment as President of NSCC, he served as a tenured professor at Indiana University, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, and at the University of Toledo. I first met Dr. Larry McDougle when he became President at NSCC in October, 1991. NSCC has blossomed under Dr. McDougle's leadership, serving as an educational gateway for approximately 3.500 students in Northwest Ohio. In addition to transfer programs, NSCC offers associate degree and certificate programs in allied health and public services, business and engineering technologies.

Dr. McDougle's leadership extends far beyond the NSCC campus. His service includes the Ohio Board of Regents Advisory Committee on Service Achievement and includes membership on the Boards of Trustees of Mercy College of Northwest Ohio, the Northwest Ohio Regional Economic Development Regional Growth Partnership, the Henry County Business and Education Advisory Council, and the Henry County Workforce Investment Board.

Dr. McDougle's work has both touched the lives of students and earned the respect of educators and employers. In 1996, he received the Philip J. Rusche Distinguished Service Award from the University of Toledo College of Education and Allied Professions. In 1998, he received the John C. Hoyt Outstanding Employment and Training Leadership Award from the Toledo Area Private Industry Council.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater gift that an educator can give a student than the gift of inspiration. Dr. McDougle has done just that. I ask each of my colleagues to join me in this special tribute. We wish the entire McDougle family good health and good fortune in the coming years.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS WITH VOUCHERS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 30, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, many of those who share my belief that the most effective education reform is to put parents back in charge of the education system have embraced government-funded voucher programs as a means to that end. I certainly sympathize with the goals of voucher proponents and I believe that States and local governments have the right, protected by the Tenth Amendment, to adopt any sort of voucher program they believe meets the needs of their communities. However, I have a number of concerns regarding proposals to implement a voucher plan on the Federal level.

The basic reason supporters of parental control of education should view Federal voucher programs with a high degree of skepticism is that vouchers are a creation of the government, not the market. Vouchers are a taxpayer-funded program benefiting a particular group of children selected by politicians and bureaucrats. Therefore, the Federal voucher program supported by many conservatives is little more than another tax-funded welfare program establishing an entitlement to a private school education. Vouchers thus raise the same constitutional and moral questions as other transfer programs. Yet, voucher supporters wonder why middle-class taxpayers, who have to sacrifice to provide a private school education to their children, balk at being forced to pay more taxes to provide a free private education for another child.

It may be argued that vouchers are at least a more efficient welfare program than continuing to throw taxpayer money at public schools. However, the likely effect of a voucher program is to increase spending on new programs for private schools while continuing to increase spending on programs for public schools. For example, Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the DC voucher program, voucher proponents vehemently denied that any public schools would lose any Federal funding. Some even promised to support increased Federal spending on DC's public and charter schools. Instead of reducing funding for failed programs, Congress simply added another 10 million dollars (from taxes or debt) to the bill to pay for the vouchers without making any offsetting cuts. In a true free market, failing competitors are not guaranteed a continued revenue stream.

Many supporters of vouchers couch their support in rhetoric about a child's right to a quality education and the need for equal educational opportunities for all. However, accepting the premise that people have a ''right'' to a good of a certain quality logically means accepting government's role in establishing standards to ensure that providers are giving their consumers a ''quality'' product. Thus, in order to ensure that vouchers are being used to fulfilling students' ''right'' to a ''quality'' education (as defined by the government) private schools will be forced to comply with the same rules and regulations as the public schools.

Even some supporters of vouchers recognize the threat that vouchers may lead to increased Federal regulation of private schools. These voucher supporters often point to the fact that, with vouchers, parents will choose which schools receive public funding to assuage the concerns of their critics. However, even if a voucher program is free of State controls at its inception, it will not remain so for long. Inevitably, some parents will choose a school whose curriculum is objectionable to many taxpayers; say an academy run by believers in the philosophy of the Nation of Islam. This will lead to calls to control the schools for which a voucher can be used. More likely, parents will be given a list of approved schools where they can use their voucher at the inception of the program. Government bureaucrats will have compiled the list to ''help'' parents choose a quality school for their children.