

as we know that we have a course of action that can command the attention of the body at large, we will make that information available.

But it is possible, as long as Members want to continue working, that on into the evening we may find ourselves holding the opportunity available to continue the work this evening. As it proceeds, if it ever comes to a point where we can give Members sort of a definitive notion that the votes will be at this time or another, we will make every effort to quickly get the information to the Members.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say in conclusion to my friend from Texas, we obviously would like to cooperate. As well, I think it is in everyone's interest to finish the business of this session of this Congress. To the extent that we can be included in understanding what we will be doing and when we will be doing it, it will expedite that process. The majority will need unanimous consent from this side of the aisle to bring the extender bill up; and I am not going to speak for everybody on our side of the aisle, but we would be inclined to do that if we are part of the process. If we are not, if it is sprung on us without any notice and with provisions that we are not comfortable with, then we are going to run into difficulty later on.

That is why I am trying to, as the gentleman from Texas aptly described it, pull from him as much information as I can this afternoon.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, throughout this day, last evening, this morning, yesterday, and as we continue to work on this, we will continue to contact the minority leadership as we have been doing, including as many long-distance phone calls as are necessary to California and other places and as many fund-raising events that we may have to interrupt, we will keep our colleagues informed.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that was necessarily necessary. That is the kind of thing that is going to keep us here longer than any of us would want.

So I would hope that we could refrain from those types of references. I did not get up here this afternoon and make reference to the comments of the gentleman before we left here for Veterans' Day that we would be here that weekend and Members had to change their schedule on both sides of the aisle. I refrained from doing that, and I would hope in the future that the gentleman from Texas would refrain from comments that he just made.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will recognize Members for Special Order speeches at this time without prejudice to the

Speaker's right to return to legislative business later today.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan will state his point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, do I not have the right to ask unanimous consent for 1 minute prior to proceeding with the 5 minutes speeches?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already begun recognition from the 5 minute list, and would advise the Member from Michigan at this point to seek unanimous consent to be recognized from the 5-minute Members list and the Chair will be happy to recognize the gentleman. This is purely a matter of recognition, not a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. But, Mr. Speaker, I only want 1 minute.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY OF MILITARY INTERVENTIONISM BRINGS DEATH, DESTRUCTION, AND LOSS OF LIFE

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, demonstrators are once again condemning America in a foreign city. This time, it is in Kabul, Afghanistan. Shouting "Death to America," burning our flag, and setting off bombings, the demonstrators express their hatred toward America.

The United States has just placed sanctions on yet another country to discipline those who do not obey our commands. The nerve of them. Do they not know we are the most powerful Nation in the world and we have to meet our responsibilities? They should do as we say and obey our CIA directives.

This process is not new. It has been going on for 50 years, and it has brought us grief and multiplied our enemies. Can one only imagine what the expression of hatred might be if we were not the most powerful Nation in the world?

Our foreign policy of military interventionism has brought us death and destruction to many foreign lands and loss of life for many Americans. From Korea and Vietnam to Serbia, Iran, Iraq and now Afghanistan, we have ventured far from our shores in search of wars to fight. Instead of more free trade with our potential adversaries, we are quick to slap on sanctions that hurt American exports and help to solidify the power of the tyrants, while seriously penalizing innocent civilians in fomenting anti-America hatred.

1330

The most current anti-American demonstrations in Kabul were understandable and predictable. Our one-time ally, Osama bin Laden, when he served as a freedom fighter against the Soviets in Afghanistan and when we bombed his Serbian enemies while siding with his friends in Kosovo, has not been fooled and knows that his cause cannot be promoted by our fickle policy.

Sanctions are one thing, but seizures of bank assets of any related business to the Taliban government infuriates and incites the radicals to violence. There is no evidence that this policy serves the interests of world peace. It certainly increases the danger to all Americans as we become the number one target of terrorists. Conventional war against the United States is out of the question, but acts of terrorism, whether it is the shooting down of a civilian airliner or bombing a New York City building, are almost impossible to prevent in a reasonably open society.

Likewise, the bombings in Islamabad and possibly the U.N. plane crash in Kosovo are directly related to our meddling in the internal affairs of these nations.

General Musharraf's successful coup against Prime Minister Sharif of Pakistan was in retaliation for America's interference with Sharif's handling of the Pakistan-India border war. The recent bombings in Pakistan are a clear warning to Musharraf that he, too, must not submit to U.S.-CIA directives.

I see this as a particularly dangerous time for a U.S. president to be traveling to this troubled region, since so many blame us for the suffering, whether it is the innocent victims in Kosovo, Serbia, Iraq, or Afghanistan. It is hard for the average citizen of these countries to understand why we must be so involved in their affairs, and resort so readily to bombing and boycotts in countries thousands of miles away from our own.

Our foreign policy is deeply flawed and does not serve our national security interest. In the Middle East, it has

endangered some of the moderate Arab governments and galvanized Muslim militants.

The recent military takeover of Pakistan and the subsequent anti-American demonstration in Islamabad should not be ignored. It is time we in Congress seriously rethink our role in the region and in the world. We ought to do more to promote peace and trade with our potential enemies, rather than resorting to bombing and sanctions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

SAVING 1 PERCENT OF THE FEDERAL BUDGET TO SECURE SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity in this 1 hour special order to invite my colleagues in the majority conference to come join in our discussion of our accomplishments, and to also define somewhat the negotiating that is going on right now between the Congress and the President with respect to getting our budget resolution passed and getting the final agreement nailed down.

Before I do that, I want to talk about one of the announcements that is coming out tomorrow from the Department of Education. Over at the Department, a number of us paid a visit to them just a couple of weeks ago when the Secretary of Education had assured the country, certainly the Congress and the White House, as well, that it was impossible to find this one penny on the dollar savings that we hoped to secure in order to save social security and prevent the President's raid on the social security program.

The Secretary of Education said there is no savings to be found in the

administration at the Department of Education, that the agency is run efficiently and is run in the most lean manner possible.

So the three of us Members of Congress who walked down there had a difference of opinion. We physically showed up on the premises and started going office to office to find out if we could not help the Secretary find that penny on the dollar, and lo and behold, we found a number of places where it would be wise to look.

We found an account called a grant back fund, for example, that has about \$725 million in there that is not spent in the way that the statutes have defined. We also found some duplicate payments to the tune of about \$40 million. We have found several other things since then.

The most remarkable thing we found is that going back to 1998, the Department of Education's books are not auditable. In fact, tomorrow the Department of Education will be receiving notification from the auditors, who are charged with auditing the Department of Education, to finding out where this money goes, they will be receiving this notice claiming, showing, certifying that the Department of Education's books are not auditable.

This is a remarkable revelation coming out of the Department, especially at a time when the Secretary ran over here immediately after we started talking about saving money and telling us with certainty that there is no savings to be found in the Department of Education. He has no basis to make such a claim. His books over at the Department of Education are not auditable.

Mr. Speaker, I just had an opportunity to visit some schoolkids in my district on Monday. I visited three schools. Children in America's schools throughout the country are much like those children in my district in Colorado. They understand accountability. They understand completing assignments on time. They understand completing the work according to their requirements and being held accountable.

When a teacher says a report is due on a certain day, the kids understand that if they do not turn it in on that day, they will get an F. The Department, when they are supposed to audit their books and certify to the Congress that their books are clean, that they have balanced, that they are auditable, we should expect them to follow through. The Department of Education has failed to accomplish that objective. They will tell us tomorrow, we cannot find where the \$120 billion in taxpayer money has been spent and how it has been spent.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague for yielding, Mr. Speaker. I just would ask my colleague, when were the reports or when was the audit or finan-

cial statement from the Department of Education due? Was it not March, or sometime earlier this year?

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is right.

Mr. HAYWORTH. So now it is November. They received an incomplete grade, basically, for lo these 9 months, and tomorrow, I guess sotto voce, in low, spoken terms, the Department of Education is going to admit that it has made an F in terms of fiscal responsibility, and even more than fiscal responsibility, fiscal accountability. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater evidence that we take the right approach to get dollars to the classroom, rather than deal with the care and feeding of a Washington bureaucracy.

I would just ask my friend, the gentleman from Colorado, and first of all, let me commend him, sir, and let me also commend my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) for making that trip 2½ weeks ago to the Department of Education.

I understand, and now help me on this, there is, in essence, a fund of cash, some have described it as a slush fund, to the tune of how many millions, \$725 million?

Mr. SCHAFFER. One of the reports on that fund suggested that there has been in the past, recently, about \$725 million. The Secretary says it is a little bit less than that, but still there are hundreds of millions of dollars, even about by the Secretary's account. The bottom line is they are not real sure.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again, so we can try to get a handle on the sums we are talking about, money that could be well spent in America's classrooms helping teachers teach and helping children learn, annually we are looking at an appropriation for that cabinet level agency of \$35 billion?

Mr. SCHAFFER. A \$35 billion annual appropriation, which is this year's appropriation, but on top of that there is another \$85 billion in loans that that department manages, so a grand total of \$120 billion is managed by the Department of Education. It effectively makes it one of the largest financial institutions in the world.

Mr. HAYWORTH. So forget, if my friend would yield further, forget the colloquialism about an 800-pound gorilla. We have a \$120 billion sum of money that in essence is unaccounted for from the department in Washington, D.C. charged with teaching responsibility and the three Rs.

Maybe that is the fact, Mr. Speaker. We talk about reading, writing, arithmetic. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, to our friends in the Department of Education, we need to teach a fourth R, responsibility, and accountability, and counting, with a C, to be able to actually handle their books.

I think it is important to inform the body, Mr. Speaker, based on current events, that we do welcome back to the Chamber the House minority leader,