

bills, the charter school and vocational education bills that will soon become law. I take real exception to this kind of blatant political gamesmanship and partisan hypocrisy.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) made these comments on the very day that he voted for the charter school bill which passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 369 to 50. The President made his comments the very next day, with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) seated directly at his side at the conclusion of a White House meeting on the budget negotiations. So which is it?

This is blatant hypocrisy. What we are really fighting here is a losing philosophical battle, because we Republicans believe that in fighting for our children's future and in trying to improve the quality of American education, we can only get there by emphasizing local control and decision-making, by putting greater emphasis on more parental involvement and choice in education, shifting the education paradigm from the providers of education to the consumers of education, raising teacher competency and strengthening accountability. And we can only do that by infusing competition and choice into the education system. It is called the market system, market principles. That is how we will get the reforms and the results that everybody wants in this country, certainly every parent, better pupil performance and higher student achievement.

So what you have been hearing in the House of Representatives over the last few days is a partisan debate on how we should proceed. And I quote, in conclusion, an editorial from a newspaper in the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that he gave me just before leaving:

"The argument behind the Democratic approach is that local officials don't have the talent, character or motivation to use the money wisely. Only the Solomons in Washington have the necessary attributes."

Mr. Speaker, our record beats their rhetoric, and that is why we are a growing majority in the Congress and in the country.

A HISTORY LESSON WORTH REMEMBERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to brush up on their history lessons. When they talk about block granting the President's teachers initiative to put 100,000 more teachers in the classroom, they should start by reviewing the history of the cops on the beat program.

In 1995, House Republicans voted to eliminate the cops on the beat program

and replace it with a block grant. But we prevailed; the program remains intact. And despite all the predictions of an out-of-control bureaucracy, the cops program has been one of the most successful and popular Federal programs in our history.

This program is making a real difference to people across this country. It is making a real difference to the people in my district in Northern California, the district just north of the Golden Gate bridge. The cops program is helping my district to be a safer place to live, a safer place to raise our children. This same program is making other districts, all of the districts across the country that much safer for families.

Since the cops program began, local police departments in my district, which includes Marin and Sonoma Counties, have received a total of more than \$4.4 million in Federal funding, including nearly \$2 million in funds for public safety departments, to hire the equivalent of 38 new police officers. Cops funding has been used for a variety of public safety programs, including establishing domestic violence reduction programs.

Guess what? There is no out-of-control bureaucracy. There are no hoops to jump through, no red tape. Police departments have had the flexibility to put officers and other resources where they need them the most. The Clinton initiative for schools to hire 100,000 new teachers would be much the same. Yet despite the overwhelming success of the targeted cops program, House Republicans want to do the same thing that they proposed for that program to the President's teachers initiative, that they tried to do before. They want to use a block grant rather than target funds to hire the new teachers. Will they never learn?

We already know that overcrowded classrooms is one of the biggest obstacles to improving education for our children, and we know that a block grant cannot guarantee our kids smaller classes unless we guarantee more trained teachers.

Democrats want to target funds to schools to hire more teachers using the title I formula.

They want to use the title VI formula. They will not use the title I formula, when title I is the most successful education funding formula and it will guarantee that our Federal dollars are used to hire teachers and, in turn, reduce class size.

Democrats also want to help schools reduce class size by financing school bond initiatives. Too many American students are trying to learn in crumbling, unsafe school buildings or in temporary trailers which have turned into permanent trailers in school parking lots.

Democrats also want many of our students that are already missing out on technology and being part of the technology superhighway to help their schools get wired.

This Congress should be helping communities repair their unsafe schools. They should be helping communities renovate their school buildings and they should be helping their communities make sure that these temporary-turned-into-permanent trailers are not a real ongoing part of their school.

Mr. Speaker, children make up 25 percent of our population, but they are 100 percent of our future. Investing in their education is the best way to invest in their future and, therefore, the best way to invest in the future of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. ROUKEMA. addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 4567

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to once again urge passage of legislation that this body passed several days ago, in fact last Saturday we passed H.R. 4567, which provides funding for home health care agencies hardest hit by changes made in last year's Medicare bill. Unfortunately the Senate has yet to address this legislation, and it is an awfully critical issue for the senior citizens as well as home health care providers in the State of Kansas and across the country.

While I recognize the need to curb Medicare costs, we need to direct changes at fraud, waste and abuse. The changes that we made last year in many cases were simply across-the-board cuts in funding, and unfortunately this has had a dramatic impact on some of the most cost-effective providers in our communities across the country.

H.R. 4567 would provide relief for our senior citizens in need of home health care. These issues are critical to many senior citizens.

Many senior citizens have attempted to keep their loved ones in home. Many people have tried to stay in their home, and they are only able to do so because of the benefits of home health care.

In my home State of Kansas, a number of those agencies that provide home health care services have already closed their doors. And for the people that they provide services to in rural areas and small communities, the loss of their home health care agency often means a loss of this service, resulting in increased cost and a lessening of the quality of life.

Home health services provide senior citizens with the opportunity to remain in their own homes with their own families, and ultimately they save