These repetitive loss properties represent an enormous cost for taxpayers. They are also a tremendous burden to residents whose lives are disrupted every time there is a flood. In many cases, these residents want to move but cannot afford to do so. By repeatedly compensating them for flood damage, current Federal law makes it easier for them to continue living where they are, rather than moving to higher ground.

I ask my colleagues to look at the bill and please comment on it.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to exchange special order times with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

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

There was no objection.

WHAT THIS CONGRESS HAS DONE FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION AND SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a previous speaker asked the question, what has this Congress done for education, and in particular, she said, what has this Congress done for public education? She should be very proud of what this Congress has done as far as education is concerned during the last 2 years.

Just a few of the issues that we have enacted into law, which the President has already signed: The Higher Education Act, a bipartisan effort; special education, signed into law, the second largest program from the Federal Government in relationship to elementary and secondary education; the Workforce Investment Act, signed into law; loan forgiveness for new teachers, signed into law; quality teaching grants, that is the law; emergency student loans, that is law; and yes, in a bipartisan way, prohibition on Federal school tests. That is in law.

This Congress has also, for public education, dealt with school nutrition and reauthorized the school nutrition legislation, very important to schools; charter schools for public schools, $100 million; quality Head Start, again, bipartisan, and again, bicameral; vocational education; Community Services Block Grant; $500 million extra for special education; and the Reading Excellence Act.

That is only 14 programs; I might say, probably more than any Congress in the history of my term in the Congress; by far anything more than I have seen in a long, long time.

The issue is not what we have done or what we may not have done; the issue is, where is the control. We believe that if we are going to reform education and make a positive effort, it starts from the bottom up. We do not try any longer, as we have done for so many years, to say, ''Here, this is coming from the Federal Government. It is good because we said it is good. We know that one-size-fits-all. You do not know anything, on the local level. You should not make any decisions. We know it all.''

That is not the way it works, and it has not worked. We ought to admit that it has not worked. We are trying something different: passing 14 pieces of legislation dealing with elementary schools, secondary schools, public schools, for $31 plus billion in this year's budget for education.

Special education got a $750 million boost last year. It is going to get another $500 million this year. This is the one unfunded curriculum mandate from the Federal Government, a 100 percent mandate from the Federal Government.

Thirty years ago local government was promised that they will get 40 percent of the excess costs. Whatever it costs them to educate a regular student, and all of that above to educate a special needs student, we will send them 40 percent. We sent them, until 2 years ago, 6 percent. We are about up to 12 percent.

But as I have mentioned so many times, in California, the Los Angeles Unified School District, it means $60 million a year, every year. Now, if we talk about reforming schools, talk about the pupil-to-teacher ratio, talk about school maintenance, what they could do with $60 million, if we would put our money where our mouth is. That is a tragedy. In the St. Louis schools there is a $25 million increase every year, and on and on it goes.

So what we have done is tried to get money back so that they could do on the local level what they want to do to improve schools. But they cannot do it because, for instance, in Los Angeles, they have to raise $325 million from their local taxpayers to pay for our 100 percent mandate. They would have that $325 million, at least they would have $60 million more at the present time.

I tried to get this point across for 20 years in the minority, and now as a member of the majority, because that is the biggest problem facing local school districts: How do we fund the 100 percent mandate? They do not know how to do that. They do not have a tax base in order to do that. The mandate came from here.

So I am pretty proud of the fact that in the last 2 years, $750 million and another $500 million. This will be the first year that local school districts will be able to reduce their spending on special ed so they can put it into maintenance, they can put it into new teachers, they can put it into additional teachers, reduce class size all of those things. But if they got the 40 percent of the excess costs, it is unbelievable what they could do on the local level.

I would hope that no one leaves the Congress this session without being proud of what we have been able to do in the area of public education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLAGOJEVICH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE STATUS OF LEGISLATION RECOMMENDED BY THE WOMEN'S CONGRESSIONAL CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon in sincere gratitude and sincere regret, in my capacity as chair of this session of the Women's Congressional Caucus. In that capacity I have worked most productively with the cochair, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON). The work we have produced I think indicates what happens when Members work together.

I want to say a word about my gratitude, and then how what we have achieved has been quite overwhelmed by what women have been denied. I want to acknowledge the innovations that we designed this year, and the must-pass agenda. It had the help of the Speaker, gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) and the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

Three of our seven priorities were passed. Two were vital to women: the reauthorization of the Mammography Quality Standards Act, which assures women that both the equipment and personnel involved in mammograms are up to standards; and sections of the Violence Against Women Act. There was a third important bill on our must-pass agenda, the Commission on Women, Minorities, and People with Disabilities in Science, Engineering, and Technology Jobs.

□ 1600

Two more bills of great importance to women I want to acknowledge. We beat back an attempt to take women out of basic training and separate them from men, and we passed an Innocent Spouse Tax Relief Act. These are very important, and I do not want to denigrate what they are.

But, Mr. Speaker, these are overwhelmed by the regret that I bring to the floor this afternoon and that regret boils down to the three Cs: Choice, Contraception and Child Care.

Mr. Speaker, if we were to ask women how they would rate this Congress, I think the three Cs would give us an F. Choice, because since the majority took control, we have had a hundred votes on choice, which should be a

settled vote in this body, 23 of them in the 105th Congress. We continue to be obsessed with choice, though the American people have laid this issue to rest. In this Congress, the Hyde amendment is no longer an appropriation rider, but became law. Shame on us.

Perhaps the greatest disappointment was in contraception, where we had a case study on how victory can be stolen from women. Because both the House and the Senate voted to include the full range of contraceptive coverage for Federal employees in Federal employees' health plans. This, which had the support of this body, majority support of this body, passed by voice vote in the Senate and was stripped out in conference in a move that deserves remark for its profound anti-democratic tactics.

Then there is the one issue we hoped would be passed this year. This should have been the year of the child. Child care would have made it the year of the child. The Women's Caucus put together what we thought was a bipartisan set of principles that would produce child care in this session. Something for each side of the aisle. For Democrats who tend to be concerned about working families, more low-income certificates. Particularly, because the welfare to work is absorbing all of the child care, leaving little for women who want to go to work, for them, for low-income families. And then for stay-at-home spouses, we said we would accept a bill for tax relief for stay-at-home spouses, and then we would accept quality that was State imposed and the Federal Government would assist the States to bring up the quality of child care.

Mr. Speaker, anybody who cannot get a bipartisan bill for our children out of that is not trying hard enough, and we have not tried hard enough in the 105th Congress as long as mainstream issues like choice, contraception, like child care are not done by this Congress.

Whatever we do, including the must-pass victories of the Women's Caucus, will be overwhelmed when the gavel goes down on this Congress. As delighted as I am by the passage of three of our four priorities, we of the Women's Caucus of the 105th Congress will have to answer the question: ''What did you do for women in the 105th?'' The answer from American women will be: Not much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. THUNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3687. An act to authorize prepayment of amounts due under a water reclamation project contract for the Canadian River Project, Texas.

H.R. 3910. An act to authorize the Automobile National Heritage Area in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4326. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Federal lands located within or adjacent to the Rogue River National Forest and to clarify the authority of the Bureau of Land Management to sell and exchange other Federal lands in Oregon.

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1222. An act to catalyze restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient financing of projects and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2039. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro as a National Historic Trail.

S. 2276. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail.

S. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the denial of benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences to developing countries that violate the intellectual property rights of United States persons, particularly those that have not implemented their obligations under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1408) ''An Act to establish the Lower East Side Tenement National Historic Site, and for other purposes.''.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1693) ''An act to provide for improved management and increased accountability for certain National Park Service programs, and for other purposes.''.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1718) ''An Act to amend the Weir Farm National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1990 to authorize the acquisition of additional acreage for the historic site to permit the development of visitor and administrative facilities and to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts for the acquisition of real and personal property.''.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1754) ''An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to consolidate and reauthorize health professions and minority and disadvantaged health education programs, and for other purposes.''.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2432) ''An Act to support programs of grants to States to address the assistive technology needs of individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.''.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last evening, a meeting was held in my office with two senior Democrats to discuss the issue of the 2000 Census. It is unfortunate that not only was the confidence of this meeting broken, but my position was misrepresented. Obviously, there are those who would betray a confidence for what they believe to be a short-term political gain.

Let me make clear what transpired at the meeting and what my position is on the 2000 Census. The position of these Democrats was that they wanted to remove Congress from the decision-making process for the 2000 Census. I disagree. At no time did I say that there would not be funding for the 2000 Census. As I have said publicly before, the one thing we can all be sure of is there will be a 2000 Census.

What I did say is the simple fact that if the Supreme Court might rule that sampling is legal, it does not automatically mean there will be sampling in the 2000 Census.

Let me explain, as I did last night. The Supreme Court is going to rule on whether or not sampling is legal or constitutional, not if the Clinton sampling plan will work. That issue is very much debatable. In fact, even the National Academy of Sciences which has endorsed the concept of sampling has not endorsed this plan.

Additionally, as I pointed out last night, the administration has been arguing that the Supreme Court case should not be considered on its merits, but rather dismissed because the House of Representatives lacks standing and the issue is not ripe for review. If this were to happen, why would Congress allow the administration to use sampling when the entire census would be invalidated in the future when standing is no longer an issue and sampling is ripe for review? We already have the writing on the wall. Two Federal courts and six Federal judges have unanimously ruled that sampling is illegal. How many judges does it take to get the message through?