

quickly and effectively. Too many people lose sight of the fact that the real issue here is how to help children and newcomers who do not know English and who need to assimilate.

Let us not forget Ernesto Ortiz and his children, Bilga Abramova and other new Americans like them. Mr. Speaker, this is not just an abstract public policy issue; bilingual education and our national language policies have real world consequences. When our policies fail, the failures have names and faces attached to them. When our policies serve to divide rather than unite us, the rips appear in the very fabric of the American Nation.

The following description of bilingual education comes from US News and World Report: "along with crumbling classrooms and violence in the hallways, bilingual education has emerged as one of the dark spots on the grim tableau of American public education. Today, the program has mushroomed into a \$10 billion-a-year bureaucracy that not only cannot promise that students will learn English but may actually do some children more harm than good."

Mr. Speaker, this should be bilingual education's epitaph. I urge all of my colleagues to see the writing on the wall. Bilingual education has had its time to prove its effectiveness; 28 years is long enough to see if this approach works. These programs were created with good intentions, I am sure. However, after almost three decades and billions of dollars, we must recognize the painful truth that bilingual education does not work.

CONGRESS PLAYING POLITICAL CHICKEN WITH NATION'S CREDIT RATING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor to speak about something else, but I ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] to stay, because I was very fascinated by what he was saying, and he only had the 5 minutes. The gentleman is saying that his committee is going to mark up this megabill that is going to cost billions of dollars, and really it is going to be basically for the fat-cat farmers?

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentlewoman will yield, yes, basically the wealthy, the farmer with a lot of acreage producing a lot of crops will benefit from it.

To give another example, down in cotton country, in west Texas and New Mexico and other places where upland cotton is grown, if they gave a good year, and it looks like next year is going to be a good year, if they follow the programs, they could make, say, half a million dollars in selling their cotton. At the same time, a father and two sons, or a father with his two brothers, as long as they have three entities, they can get \$40,000 each. They will get that whether they farm or not.

If they make half a million dollars, they are still going to get \$120,000 from the Government. If they do not farm at all, they decide, "Well, we are going to

quit farming, we are going to let the land stay idle. Let us go down south for a while," they get \$120,000. That is right. They do not have to farm at all.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is absolutely astounding. They get paid whether they decide to work or not?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this is a welfare program that makes welfare look tough.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, it makes AFDC and food stamps and everything so little and so pikey. And yet they on that side made a big to-do on how we have to save all of this money, getting back to kids eating, to school lunches, and then giving big farmers, many of which have their own airplanes and their own big cars and Mercedes and make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, they are going to give them money.

Like I said before, in the chairman's own district, it has been estimated that in the chairman's own district in western Kansas, he has 85 percent of his wheat farmers in the program. So they will, each one of them will get on the average, estimated on the average, \$30,000 a year, even if they do not farm. If they do, and next year wheat prices are looking real good, and they make a \$100,000, they still are going to make that \$30,000.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. They do not have to give it back?

Mr. VOLKMER. No, no, it is guaranteed.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for staying. I know the gentleman is very busy.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman is saying is classic about what is going on around here. This place is basically shut down. They throw out a bill, and we find out all of these special interests here in it. Here we are, playing political chicken with the credit rating of this Nation. This is outrageous.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, it is the same thing that happened in the 100 days. Remember, if we were on the committee, we got the bill that morning. Guess what, I got the final version of their bill this morning, and we are going to mark it up at 2 o'clock.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri. He is obviously a speed reader, if he got through it that fast, and the rest of us will never see it.

Mr. Speaker, it will be like the committee that I am on that came to the floor last week. The Committee on National Security got notice that there were two copies of the bill, and we could go in the morning and could go to the room where the two copies of the bill were located. We could spend our time reading the bill, of course, this thick. Get a clue.

So I must say, this is really very troubling as to what is going on here

and how stuff is ramrodded through, and we are getting paid, but we are doing nothing. We are becoming like the farmers, I guess. We get paid whether we legislate or not or whether we do anything realistic or not. Here we are, this is great. I guess we are changing our programs so that everybody else gets to be like Members of Congress.

This is a light month; February, we are hardly here. But the tragedy is, this is a very serious month. This is the month when the birthdays of Washington and Lincoln come up. I wonder what they must be thinking that we are celebrating their birthday in February by pushing this country to the brink of shoving its credit rating right off the side.

Mr. Speaker, I think of every American family sitting around their kitchen table, and one of the things they are terribly worried about is obviously their credit rating. In America, if one's credit rating goes sour, they are going to have a very tough life. If our country's credit rating goes sour, we are going to look like fools on this planet.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is really time that we all come and have some debates about those issues. We owe that to the people sitting around the kitchen table dealing with those issues in their own family budgets. For crying out loud, we are paid to deal with this Nation's budget. We are now 5 months into the fiscal year, and we have not done it. It is about time we get on with it.

OPPOSE FRANCE'S NUCLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I urge your support for a letter which will be delivered to French President Jacques Chirac when he arrives in Washington this week.

Our letter expresses our support for France's decision to end its recent series of nuclear testing, as well as our concern about the long-term damage caused by the tests in the first place.

Our letter is simple and to the point: while we oppose France's series of nuclear tests that began this past September, we ask that the French Government permanently close its testing facilities and immediately begin a comprehensive cleanup operation.

France's decision to conduct a series of tests prior to enacting a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty is hypocritical and lacks the sound judgment of a country that aspires to world leadership.

By continuing with these unlawful tests, France undermined its credibility in the world community. We are now forced to question the French Government's reliability in what they say is their commitment to eliminate nuclear weapons.