They go to school to learn how to teach. They are dedicated and bring a personal passion to the job that is before them. Then they are thrown into a classroom situation where they are not treated like professionals, where they are asked to do more than teach children. They are asked to be social workers, guidance counselors, drug rehabilitators and, on occasion, substitute parents.

Many teachers rise to that occasion and they respond remarkably well. But I say this, if we really want to treat teachers like real professionals, I would suggest that we ought to create a system where they are allowed to become incredibly wealthy, that the value of a teacher is measured by their contribution to the organization. If they have a line of parents outside their door wanting their service, they ought to be treated like real professionals, like the doctor who has the same situation, like the lawyer who has clients waiting outside the door, like the insurance agent, the real estate agent, any professional that has people wanting their service ought to be able to be treated in a way that honors and respects the contributions that they make to their community, to their school and ultimately to the lives of children.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that if you listen very carefully to the debates that have taken place over the last couple weeks, if you want to define the essence, the difference between those of us who really care about improving the quality of schools in our country and those who want to preserve the centralized authority here in Washington, it all comes down to this, and I will conclude on this point. There are those in this Chamber on the other side of the aisle with a far different perspective who believe you measure fairness in education by the relationship between school buildings or different education bureaucracies.

We, on the other hand, believe you measure education fairness in America upon the relationship between children, no matter where they are, whether they are educated in the home, in a private school, in a public school or in any other setting. We focus on the fairness of children. That is what every one of our bills and initiatives here in Washington as a conservative Republican majority have entailed.

That is what we will continue to fight for day. After day. After day until at the end we can finally agree that we have restored the hope and the vision of our country as a society of well-educated citizens.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BOB SCHAFFER]. I knew his position on this matter. I know his heart.

Mr. Speaker, this subject commands such a commitment among the Members of the House that we have found ourselves this evening with an embarrassment of riches on the subject. We had the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], who came in earlier, had to go out to another discussion. We had the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], who had to go off and will be back later to renew his discussions on this subject. We have the gentlewoman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP], who sat and waited until it became evident that the time would run out and she would not be able to participate this evening, but who has a commitment to this.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we have my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who still sits here and waits his turn as the clock runs down.

□ 1930

If I could close, Mr. Speaker, on this comment. DUKE CUNNINGHAM is a man who is devoted to these children. His wife is a professional educator. DUKE has himself been an educator among his many occupations in life. I have worked with him on the committee that deals with education. He has a great deal to offer and in fact has offered and given a great deal already. It is our loss that we did not have time for Mr. CUNNINGHAM to speak in this hour this evening, but I can tell you the blessing is that he will not quit, he will not go away, he will be back and when he returns to the subject, he says each child will be cared for.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM is so enthusiastic about speaking, he has just suggested, Mr. Speaker, that I ask unanimous consent that my special order be extended for 5 minutes so that indeed he can have an opportunity to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALSH). The gentleman's request is not in order. The procedure is that a Member may not address the House for more than 1 hour in a special order.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the Speaker and I thank Mr. CUNNINGHAM for his devotion and dedication.

REQUEST FOR 5–MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

IN THE MATTER OF CONTESTED ELECTION IN CALIFORNIA'S 46TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, earlier today we had a resolution on the floor that unfortunately did not achieve success but should have. Almost 6 months ago, the Los Angeles Times stated that, quote, it is time to wrap up the House inquiry, unquote, which, quote, has produced no evidence that Congresswoman SANCHEZ' victory, which was in the 46th District of California, was the result of electoral fraud. That is the Los Angeles Times of April 22 of this year.

Echoing this was a Washington Post editorial that noted that in the Dornan-Sanchez case, quote, no credible evidence has yet been offered that votes were affected in sufficient numbers to alter the outcome of the race. Washington Post, July 28 of this year.

Just recently, again the Los Angeles Times pointed out, quote, there has been no evidence yet that SANCHEZ benefited from fraudulent votes, and the next regularly scheduled election is only 14 months away. That was back on September 23, 1997.

Yet despite all of these independent statements by all of these newspapers who are looking at the facts and circumstances as they have unfolded since the election took place last November, the fact of the matter is that Republicans continue to drag out this process. They have done so with hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxpayer moneys having been spent, and yet no clear and convincing evidence, no preponderance of evidence, no evidence beyond a reasonable doubt being presented to substantiate that Congresswoman SANCHEZ' election should not be upheld.

It is clear to many of us why Republicans continue to pursue this matter. This is an all-out effort to intimidate and harass new citizens and those with foreign surnames and stop them from voting. This is plain from the fact that Republicans are not checking the citizenship of voters in any other close election across the country. As the President of the nonpartisan League of Women Voters has noted, the committee investigation is, quote, being carried out in ways that may intimidate future voters. Limiting access to the voting booth has been the plan all along.

Just after the election, the Los Angeles Times reported that, quote, Dornan has said his Republican colleagues are seeking a case to use in challenging voter registration procedures nationwide. In targeting this election, Republicans have selected a seat where Hispanic voting played a vital role in the outcome of the election. Republicans have every reason to hope that Hispanic and other minority voters stay