

than a balanced budget in 7 years, using Congressional Budget Office numbers.

So Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we Republicans have kept our word. We have done our job. We have made good on our promise and our commitment to the American people to pass a balanced budget and to finally get our Nation's fiscal house in order. We have worked hard, fought many battles over these past 11 months to develop the first balanced budget in 26 years and to do it in a way that offers real deficit reduction based on honest numbers and does not entail a major tax increase imposed on the backs of the American people. To the contrary, we want to relieve and reduce taxes on the middle and working classes.

So no matter how hard the President might try to wiggle out of his agreement, which again he signed 30 days ago, we Republicans are not going to settle now for a phony budget based on cooked White House numbers.

The worst thing, the worst thing that we could do now is to go along with the White House in pretending to balance the budget, while leaving all of the difficult decisions to be fought out again in future Congresses. So that is why, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we are insisting that in this session of Congress, before this month and this year are out, we work out a bipartisan agreement here in the Congress and with the President and his administration on a 7-year plan which balances the Federal budget, again using honest numbers provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

This is so important because the American people lose faith in their political institutions when politicians fail to keep their word.

Republicans in this Congress are establishing a new standard. We have said that from now on, any politician who makes a promise to the American people had better be prepared to keep it; and that certainly goes for Bill Clinton who again, 30 days ago, promised by signing this law to enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

So no more excuses, no more Washington gimmicks, it is time for the President and our colleagues, Democratic colleagues here in the Congress, to do the right thing for our children's future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The Members are reminded that the President is to be referred to with the proper respect accorded him under the Rules of the House.

AMERICANS SEE THROUGH SCARE TACTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the administration and the minority have waged a real campaign of misinformation regarding the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995, and I think it is finally starting to catch up with them.

On Medicare they say that the Republican plan is extreme, will gut the program and will devastate the program, but ABC's Ted Koppel on "Nightline" last week showed that the President and the minority were misinforming the public, that the Republicans were increasing Medicare, and that senior citizens were the victims of an orchestrated scare campaign.

We have the same type of scare campaign lodged against Republicans with regard to what our balanced budget plan does with education, including student loans. The administration has used the power and the high profile of the office of the presidency to scare young people into believing Republicans plan to balance the budget, and that would prevent them from obtaining student loans. The President just as recently as last week said the Republicans cut deeply into student loans.

He also claims we are increasing the cost of student loans, and I think it is time to set the record straight. As you can see, in 1995, we spent \$24.5 billion on student loans. At the end of our 7-year plan, we spend \$36.4 billion. That is a 50 percent increase, hardly cutting student loans. Therefore, who knows how many young people out there have been scared by these tactics, have given up on college because they think loans will not be available? How many parents believe now that they will not be able to help their children with a college education because of the scare tactics that are used? As I said, it is time to set that record straight.

They also tell us in relationship to Pell grants that student should worry. Well, here is the Pell grant chart. In 1990, maximum grant \$2,300; 1995, maximum grant, \$2,340; in 1996, under our plan, \$2,440, the highest point in history for Pell grants. So again, I think it is very important that we set the record straight so that we do not have students or parents worrying about what we may be doing or may not be doing with student loans and Pell grants.

Mr. Speaker, we hear the same thing about education in general, and I think it is very important that we take a look at this and set the record straight. You will notice from this chart that the minority, when they were in the majority during the previous 7 years, spent \$315.1 billion over a 7-year period on elementary, secondary education, job training, student loan funding. Our 7-year proposal proposes to spend \$340.8 billion during that 7-year period, which again shows that we plan to spend \$25 billion more on education than what the minority spend during the last 7 years, again setting the record straight.

I would like to briefly review again some of the things that were said this afternoon when we had the debate in relationship to the President's budget. The minority leader indicated that he has real concerns about school lunch, and I said that I welcome him to the group who has that concern, because I have a real concern about student lunches. My concern is that after all of the money that we have spent from the Federal level, 50 percent of all of the students who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals are not participating, 50 percent. Where are those children getting any food? Where are they getting any nutrition? Are we trying to educate them on an empty stomach?

I am not so concerned about the fact that only 46 percent of the paying customers, the eligible paying customers participate, because obviously they have money for breakfast, obviously they have money for lunch; but what about that 50 percent who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals and are not participating? That is why the minority leader and I should have a concern; that is why we should do what the young lady from Arkansas said this afternoon.

She said she did not come here to promote the status quo, and I welcome her to our opportunity to change the status quo and do a better job in providing education for our youngsters and providing school lunch and child nutrition programs.

One other said that we are decimating education. Well, again, as I indicated here, we increase dramatically in a 7-year period our participation in education programs.

So again, I would hope that we can make sure that the public understands exactly what we are doing. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to get something straight. The President was on television the other night saying that he rejected, quote, the Republican package because among other things, according to him, it slashed and cut education.

Now, are these the same numbers, the increase, for example, in job training and student loan funding, the \$340.8 billion that is projected under the Republican plan for the next 7 years, those numbers were in front of the President while he was standing there telling the American people that the plan cut education?

Mr. GOODLING. It is just the opposite of what we are doing. We are increasing by \$25 billion over the next 7 years over what the former majority spent.

Mr. HUNTER. But he had that increase in front of him in the plan and obviously his analysts put it into executive summary for him: What it does in education, what it does in other areas; but he had that while he looked at the camera and said, this slashes education. He had those numbers in front of him, correct?

Mr. GOODLING. I am sure he had those numbers before him. Whether anyone in the administration has read the Republican budget, I cannot prove. If they had, they would not continue to misinform the American public about what we are doing in nutrition or disinform, because I was corrected by an English teacher who was watching me once before from some other person's district, and she said, he is using the word misinformation, it is disinformation, she said, because they know it is wrong.

□ 2000

Mr. HUNTER. I would just say to my friend, first, thanks. We all owe you a real debt of gratitude for setting the record straight.

But, second, this is kind of tragic, that the President of the United States, who has these numbers in front of him, has obviously scared a lot of people. If I had not seen the gentleman's numbers that he is presenting tonight and did not know anything about this plan and heard him describing the Republican education numbers, it would give me the impression that we were slashing that \$315 billion that the Democrats spent over the last 7 years in half, or doing something like that. But there is no way that any reasonable individual could conclude from the President's remarks that we were actually increasing the amount of money to be spent on job training and student loan funding, which in fact we are under out program.

Mr. GOODLING. When the tragedy is of course that we are using children and we are using senior citizens to make whatever point the administration wants to make. That is a real tragedy, because you are upsetting the most vulnerable people we have in our entire constituency when it is not correct. The figures are incorrect. What we are doing is improving.

What we try to do, however, is insist on quality. That is where we run into a philosophical difference because of course the status quo is what they want. It has always been their philosophy to pour more money into the program, and somehow or other the program will get better.

As I will point out later after some of the others have an opportunity to participate, the programs have not gotten better, and the programs have not helped the disadvantaged that we were trying to help. My chairman used to say that all the time, "The programs, BILL, are not helping those we were trying to help."

I would always say, "Let's change them." But we could never change them. Now we have an opportunity to change them so that we help the very people that we were trying to help but in fact we disadvantaged.

I yield to the gentleman from California, another member of the committee.

Mr. RIGGS. I very much appreciate the chairman yielding to me, since I

have the honor and pleasure of serving under his chairmanship on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

I also find myself in sort of a dual capacity as an appropriator serving on the funding side of the equation, if you will, on the House Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee. And I very much appreciate this special order opportunity to point out, I was going to say some of the misinformation and deliberate distortion that has taken place around the education and job training issues, specifically funding for the various Federal education and job training programs, but I think in fact disinformation is a more apt and correct description.

I want to start out by pointing out, Mr. Chairman, something that you already know, one of the best kept secrets in official Washington, and that is, in the President's own budget, the budget that no Democrat Member of the House or Senate would offer, but the budget that was offered by two Republican Senators in the other body and was defeated on a vote of 96 to 0, in that budget the President proposed \$2.2 billion in education spending cuts.

I have not heard the news media report on that fact as recently as yesterday, when the President went across the Potomac River to a public school in Arlington, in northern Virginia. So I think we ought to start out this special order by just pointing out some facts about the President's plan.

The minority whip is on the floor. Perhaps he would like to engage in a gentlemanly conversation or colloquy, because I would love to hear some short of explanation given regarding the President's plan. Because when you look at his proposed budget, he recommended terminating 16 education programs in the 1995 rescissions bill, which has become law, another 21 programs in his 1996 budget request, and 4 more programs which would begin phaseout in 1996. These 41 program terminations requested by the President total approximately \$803 million in savings.

Now if we were doing that, that would be \$803 million in cuts, not savings, that could be applied to deficit reduction or some other important purpose of the Federal Government. The President has actually embraced our idea of consolidating those programs that can be consolidated with education programs at the State and local level. He has embraced our idea of terminating those programs which are redundant or for that matter which have never been funded by the Congress, and streamlining the delivery of Federal taxpayer services for public education. In total, he has recommended terminating and consolidating 68 programs for a total savings of \$757 million.

Those recommendations were incorporated into the 1995 rescissions bill and the 1996 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations

bill which has already passed this body, the House, and is now pending action in the other body.

This proves, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, that the White House agrees with Republicans on the concept of reducing the number of unneeded and outdated education programs, that they agree that it is time to stop throwing money at the problem of poor educational results in American, and to start getting parents and local communities involved again in real solutions to the problem with learning and public education, the bootstrap improvement of public education in this country at the grassroots level.

Those are all concepts that we very much believe in and, as the chairman has pointed out, we are proposing in our different concepts. This works on both the macro level as well as the micro level.

I hope we will talk a little bit about the current what I regard as a crisis in the District of Columbia public schools before we complete our special order tonight, where I think we do have a very real oversight responsibility to the District of Columbia public schools. Perhaps we can talk a little bit about some of the reforms that we have put forward to improve this crisis situation that prevails in the District of Columbia public schools today, but that is sort of a micro application of education reform.

But whether we are talking macro or micro educational reform, we are, as you have already said, Mr. Chairman, demanding results from Federal programs for the Federal taxpayer dollar rather than simply throwing more money at programs that are not working. We want less Washington interference, we want to respect the long-standing American tradition of decentralized decisionmaking and decentralized management in public education which the chairman knows so well from his distinguished career in public education as a school administrator. And we want to demand tangible results from Federal programs. We want proof that those programs are actually helping and serving students and not Federal bureaucrats.

I just want to make two other quick comments before yielding back to the chairman so we can go on to our other colleagues. But I want to reemphasize the chairman's point because I think this is terribly important.

We have gotten a new term in Washington jargon about school lunching, as part of the official rhetoric and sometimes the demagoguery that comes out of Washington. We do not want to be "school lunched" by the minority party when we are talking about some of the other reforms contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

This is so misleading and patently unfair, because what we proposed to do was take, as the chairman well knows, 6 separate school-based nutrition programs and consolidate them into one

block grant for State and local education agencies. We have a requirement in the block grant that limits the amount that State education agencies can take off the top for administration of the program, and we effectively force almost all of the money down to the local community level where it can be used to meet the nutritional needs of our kids in local schools.

That was our proposal. Why have six separate programs, the before school, after school, hot lunch, school milk program?

Mr. GOODLING. Summer feedings.

Mr. RIGGS. Why have all these programs, each with their own set of rules and regulations, each requiring a separate application from local education agencies to Washington? Why not, instead of that very bureaucratic process, full of red tape and regulatory hurdles, why not put them all in a block grant?

That is what we did. In putting them in a block grant, we proposed to increase spending for the school-based nutrition block grant 4.5 percent each and every year for the next 5 years, a total increase in spending of \$1 billion in school nutrition programs.

Mr. GOODLING. Here is a good example, because in the red is what the President proposed in 1995 and what the President proposed in 1996. This is what we proposed, the 4.5-percent increase in each one of those years.

Mr. RIGGS. The other criticism that we heard from the other side and their allies across the country was that we eliminated mandatory Federal nutritional standards for this block grant program. Well, what we did instead, of course, as the chairman well knows, is suggest voluntary nutritional standards.

We know full well that, because this goes back to the canard that in the absence of mandatory nutritional standards, somehow, some way, local school districts are going to start feeding our kids ketchup, when we know that is just a bald falsehood. But I also know from my own experience as a local school board member, which I am sure the chairman as a former school principal and educational administrator would attest to, we know from our personal firsthand experiences that if any local school district in this country attempted to feed their kids ketchup, they would hear about it loud and clear at the very next school board meeting.

I appreciate the chairman giving me the opportunity to join the special order to make that point, and also re-emphasize his point that we are proposing to increase funding for school loans, by \$12 billion, from \$24 billion today in 1995 to \$36 billion in the year 2002. That proposal is incorporated into our plan, our 7-year plan for balancing the Federal budget known as the B Balanced Budget Act of 1995, a \$12 billion increase in spending for student financial aid, student loans, and as the chairman has already pointed out, next year we will witness the highest level of Pell grants in our country's history.

So so much for these claims as we have heard. I actually gathered some of the more descriptive adjectives that I have seen in my local media back home in the First Congressional District, in and around the First Congressional District of California. We have heard descriptions used such as drastic, catastrophic, devastating, used to describe our proposals.

I hope that our constituents and fellow Americans listening to us tonight realize that a \$12 billion spending increase for student loans, a \$1 billion spending increase for school nutrition programs is hardly drastic, catastrophic or devastating. And I hope they will be able to see, with the help of this special order and other efforts such as this special order, through all this deliberate distortion and misleading rhetoric. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOODLING. You mentioned consolidating programs, that the President was interested in consolidating and eliminating some and we are interested in doing that.

It is interesting, I think, for the public to understand that there are 500 education programs on the Federal level. Only one-third of those are in the Department of Education, and the Department of Education cannot tell us where the others are, nor can they tell us whether they are effective, nor can they tell us how much they are costing, which means we are probably wasting about \$100 billion on these phantom programs somewhere that apparently are not very effective because nobody seems to know anything about them.

I yield to another colleague from our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the chairman for yielding. I would like to just reference some of the comments from my colleague from California.

Not only is going from 298 and increasing by \$12 billion, not only is that not catastrophic, not only is that not devastating, I believe that—and my principal can correct me, perhaps—I believe that in 99 percent of the country, every place but Washington, when you go from 298 and you go up by \$12 billion, I believe every place else in the country that is not a cut. I believe that that is an increase. It is the same thing for a number of other programs.

If I could just then talk a little bit about the bigger picture because also, in addition to serving on the Education and Economic Opportunity Committee, I also serve on the Budget Committee, and just frame it a little bit because I think as the chairman has laid out so effectively, we are increasing spending on a number of different programs.

People ask, "Well, now can that be? You guys are cutting the budget in Washington." In reality we are just slowing the growth.

We are slowing the growth for a very, very important reason. I think that is why last week, Friday, so many of us

were disappointed, because in the middle of November we thought we had reached an agreement with the President.

We thought that we had reached an agreement that said he was going to submit to us a plan to balance the budget, a plan to balance the budget within 7 years, and that he would use Congressional Budget Office numbers. So that we then could take our plan to balance the budget, compare it to his plan to balance the budget, and we could get off of this debate about whether balancing the budget was important or not, but that we would all agree and then we could actually get into the policy differences.

That did not happen. Last week, Friday, the President, we were expecting his plan. He did present a plan. The disappointing thing with the plan is that that plan never got to zero. I think the best estimate said that in year 7 there would still be a \$75 billion deficit, and the number could be higher than that. It just did not reach zero.

Actually, when I was back in my district a couple of weeks ago and talking to some of my constituents, they said, "PETE, we are really disappointed. Ever since you got to Washington, you forgot the word surplus."

When you were in the private sector, working for a publicly held corporation, a Fortune 500 company, the expectation from your shareholders, from your employees, was that you would deliver a profit.

□ 2015

Now that the gentleman has gotten to Washington, he thinks that getting to zero is good enough. It is kind of like, yes, you are right, we ought to be talking about a surplus because what we are really trying to do here in this bigger picture, in a positive and constructive way, is we are trying to, I think, preserve the future for our kids, provide them with the educational opportunities, the educational reforms, the education spending that can create a positive educational environment for our kids but from an economic standpoint can do the right things, that says we are going to gradually move to balancing the budget and hopefully after that getting to a surplus so that we can start paying back the debt because what we are doing today is we are saddling onto our kids \$4.9 trillion, close to \$5 trillion worth of debt.

A kid born in my district today, in the gentleman's district, anywhere in this country is going to pay in their lifetime \$187,000 of interest on the debt if we do not change the way that we do our spending programs. They will face effective tax rates of 82 percent.

Most of these are discretionary programs, correct, the discretionary part of the budget. What happens to these programs in the year 2012 when the only money that we have coming in for tax revenues, it is only available for entitlement programs? What happens to a lot of these programs?

Mr. GOODLING. They are going to fall with their weight.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. They are going to be gone.

Mr. GOODLING. They will not be able to be funded.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. There will not be any money for education if we do not, and I do not consider these tough decisions, I consider these reasonable decisions to reform and slow the growth of Federal spending.

Remember, in 1995 we spent, what, the numbers are big, \$1.5 trillion. The year 2002, we are not going to be spending \$1.4 trillion, it is not going down. We are going to be spending \$1.85 trillion. We are going to add \$350 billion more per year to spend. What we are trying to do is allocate those dollars toward the priorities that we think are important for this country.

So we are not cutting spending. We are trying to more effectively target the programs. The chairman has done an excellent job of identifying reforms in a number of programs so that these dollars will go back to the States, will go back to the kids in more effective ways.

We had the vote today on the President's budget which does not get us to zero. I applaud the vote that we had today; 412 Members of this Congress, of this House, stood up and said, a \$75 billion deficit in year 7 is not good enough. We need to do better than that. We need to do better than that for our kids, for the next generation. We are going to have, and I think the House is going to have, to take the lead. We have worked hard all year. We have developed a lot of innovative new programs, a lot of reforms.

The House has led the way. I think we are going to have to lead, we are going to have to lead the President now because this is an historic debate. Are we finally going to take the lead in actually having a realistic plan to balance the budget? Or what a lot of my constituents are afraid of, they are afraid that there was a plan to balance the budget in the mid-1980s, there was one to balance it in the late 1980s. There was a Bush plan in 1990. There was President Clinton's plan in 1993, all of which have two things in common. They all promised to balance the budget, and they have all failed miserably.

We still have a \$160 billion deficit. We are going to make sure that this Congress comes down and that we do not join that pattern. We are not the fifth in a series of failures. This Congress is actually going to go through the process and say, we are going to have a real plan. We are going to come back next year. We are going to monitor the programs and the changes and the reforms that we have made. We are going to fix them where they do not work, and we are going to build on them where they do. But we are also going to come back and make sure that we hit year 1 of the 7-year plan. Then I think we will do it the Republican way.

We are not going to meet the targets of year 2. We are going to exceed, not

exceed in spending, we are going to beat the deficit targets, and we are going to improve on these plans, because I still think there is room for improvement. We just have to get better at monitoring, reforming and transferring power out.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I had recently a letter that was devastating to me, because it came from someone who I admire greatly and someone with whom I am very close. He bought the rhetoric that he has heard and the things that he has read that somehow or other we are cutting education and we are cutting nutrition. Therefore, he decided that I was not doing what he and I had talked about to improve education and training in this country.

He equated, I suppose, additional funds with the improvement, and what I was trying to do was just the opposite. I was trying to do what he and I talked about, and that was to move us from access only, access to mediocrity, to access to quality. And so I tried to point out to the American public that we have spent \$90 billion on title I, \$90 billion since its inception.

Then I read what the department says. The department says, under program effectiveness, comparisons of similar cohorts by grade and poverty show that program participation does not reduce the test score gap for disadvantaged students. Indeed, they went on, chapter 1 students scores in all poverty cohorts declined between the third and fourth grades.

What I am trying to say is that it does not matter whether we spend \$180 billion. If it is not directed toward quality, if we are not demanding more from these students, then, of course, we are spending the money to develop mediocrity. We cannot survive if we do that.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I had much the same dialogue with a very good friend of mine back in Michigan. We were talking about head start and said, you are taking money away from some of the neediest kids. I thought, well, I will come back, and I talked with the staff and said, give me the numbers on head start.

We have gone through this earlier this year. We felt good about what we did. But some people have heard some things. Let me revisit the Head Start Program. Got the numbers and, kind of like 1989, we were spending \$1.2 billion, \$1.2 billion is a lot of money. I worked for a Fortune 500 company for 15 years. We tried to get to be a billion dollar company. They finally hit it this last year, and 5000 families depend on this company. It is a lot of money.

But in 1989, \$1.2 billion. Now 1995, we are spending \$3.5 billion. So this program had tripled, almost tripled in the amount of dollars that were being spent. I think the chairman is an expert on this, but one of the things that has happened is, you would think that the number of kids being served by the program might have at least doubled or tripled just like the dollars, but the

number of kids served has only gone up by 40 percent.

Some of the studies that we have gotten back have said parts of this program are working. Some of it is not working, perhaps, or is not working quite as well as what we need.

I think we did a very good thing. We basically stabilized the growth. We cut it by, what, by about 3 percent this year. So we are still spending 3.4 billion, and we said, this program has grown very, very quickly over the last number of years. We are getting mixed kinds of feedback. Let us step back and assess the program, see what is working, see what is not. Let us make sure that we do not just dump a lot of money on it.

I think people too often, they have peeled the onion back. Just throwing dollars at these programs does not mean that they are accomplishing the goals that we have set out. I think that is the same thing that the gentleman was bringing out in his point.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, as I tried to point out this afternoon, and the gentleman just pointed out, this program, Head Start, has grown 186 percent in 5 years as far as dollars are concerned. But, again, there was less than 40 percent in increased student participation. But it was the health and human service inspector general who said, the reason for the problems is that we increased the money so dramatically that we have sloppy program management. They also then go on to say that only 50 percent of the programs they would rate as good programs.

So again we are talking about getting quality programs so that these children have an opportunity to be successful and get a part of the American dream. And just throwing money at mediocrity will not improve their chances of making a success of life. I think that is why we have to talk about reforms.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, sloppy program management, what does that mean when we have sloppy program management on \$3.5 billion? Sloppy program management, private sector, my boss came to me and said, you have got sloppy program management. We were not talking anywhere on these kinds of numbers, but it means dollars going down the drain that are not being used for the goals and the objectives that we have set.

It is maybe time to step back and take a look and not throw more money at it but say, let us take a look at the money that is going there, that \$3.5 billion. Let us tighten up our program assessment, our criteria so that we can get more effectiveness out of \$3.4 billion or \$3.5 billion rather than just throwing another \$2- or \$300 billion at it, because that \$2- or \$300 billion is going to be administered how? Sloppy program management means a portion of it is gone before we ever educate one more child.

Mr. GOODLING. Every administration, not just this administration, but

every administration and every Congress, each administration would say, give us more money for these two programs. All the Congress would say, more money for the program. No one paid very much attention until the last couple years as to the possibility that maybe it is mediocrity rather than quality that is being produced out there.

So, all we are saying is, sit up and take notice. These children deserve more than mediocrity. They deserve excellence. We need to demand more from them so that they have an opportunity to get a part of the American dream.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, one thing that we have not mentioned tonight is the three of us and our other colleagues in the majority on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities are in the process of developing a very ambitious legislative agenda to address educational reform and improvement in America for next year, 1996.

I want to salute the gentleman from Michigan in particular because he is the chairman of our newly created Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. He has helped us attend to one of our fundamental responsibilities as Members of Congress, and that is performing legislative oversight of these different programs.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned just a moment ago the chapter 1 program, the basic skills education program, which was originally intended, going back to the congressional intent in the authorizing legislation, to help the most disadvantaged and to provide some assistance from the Federal taxpayer to low income school districts.

This program has grown in leaps and bounds as well. I am just looking down here at the latest information. Again recent studies demonstrate that the program has the long-term impact of improving educational achievement. That, after all, ought to be the bottom line.

I fully agree with the premise that equating money with educational progress or educational achievement is really a false equation. Education funding has risen steadily and dramatically in America in recent years. Yet test scores, probably the best barometer for gauging pupil achievement and educational performance, have shown little or no improvement. But this particular program, this chapter 1 program, is no longer targeted to the most disadvantaged. Ninety percent of the school districts in America receive this funding, including, as the chairman knows, the 100 most affluent school districts that received \$490 million, almost half a billion dollars, in fiscal year 1994.

So it has become an operational subsidy that local school districts are now relying on, more largesse from the Federal taxpayer. There is no connection or nexus necessarily between this Fed-

eral taxpayer funding and results. As I mentioned at the outset, in my remarks, we are interested in results. That is why performing the oversight function, the oversight responsibility, of the legislative branch of Government is so important so that we really can take a hard look and determine which programs are working well, which programs are producing results and the proper bang for the taxpayer dollar.

Mr. GOODLING. And I think it is important to point out that together the administration, the majority, the minority, brought about a careers bill that took all of those, again, programs, 163, 153, how many ever may be out there again, who knows how many Federal programs that are there for job training, and together we said we got to get some quality programs out there. All we are doing is spending money so thinly all over everything that we do not know if we are accomplishing anything to help people to be better trained, and in this day and age they have to get trained and retrained constantly, and so we work together to do it, and I would call on the minority and the administration to do the same thing now for every other program. Do not keep accepting the idea that we cannot admit that they have not done well. Let us admit that we failed and then say from what we have learned we can build quality programs.

That is, I think, the message that we should get out to everybody.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned the, and so did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] the concept of transferring responsibility and authority out of Washington back down to State and local communities, and I tried to make the point that again the centralized decision making is fundamental to America education, but I want to—you mentioned the career legislation that I, all three of us, worked on in this House, and it uses the concept of block grants, as does the school-based nutrition program as potentially further legislative initiatives will in the future. Yet our political opponents and their allies have managed to kind of give this concept of block grants a bad name. It is sort of a nasty term now when people talk about block grants, and I think we ought to point out that what we are attempting to do is consolidate programs first of all, which gives us the opportunity to identify those that can be eliminated because they are either redundant with State or local programs or they are better performed at the State or local level, and you pointed out that with the careers work force development job training consolidation legislation—that is quite a mouthful, but you pointed out that there is something like 160 separate Federal job-training programs, what we call categorical programs, and they are spread across virtually the entire Federal bureaucracy, administered by 14 different departments and agencies. So we

thought it would make sense to take those programs, consolidate them down into a few block grants; in the case of the careers legislation, ultimately three block grants, and then use those block grants to transfer the authority and the revenue down to the State and local level with proper oversight from the Federal Government and the Congress as the legislative branch of Government so that these programs would be closer to the people they are intended to serve. In the process of doing that consolidation and streamlining, Mr. Speaker, we assumed that there would be an administrative cost savings that we could then use to our long-term plans to balance the Federal budget and ultimately generate a budget surplus which is so critically important, as the gentleman from Michigan has already pointed out, in order to pay down and pay off that \$5 trillion national debt, \$1.5 trillion of which are funds borrowed from the trust funds of the Federal Government including Social Security. So we are moving on two paths here. We want to improve programs by emphasizing results, not just money, and we want to do the very best things that we can possibly do for the future of our children even before improving the quality of American education, bootstrapping the performance of our schools, and that is balancing the Federal budget and getting our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Mr. GOODLING. And I think it is very important to point out to the American people what I have pointed out in committee time and time again, and what I pointed out here on the floor, and what I pointed out to the Governors. We are not talking about revenue sharing. We do not have any revenue to share. We are talking about this is what we expect you to accomplish, these are the goals you must reach, you use your creativity, you use what you know on the local level to bring about the changes that have to be brought about, if we are going to move from mediocrity to excellence.

So we are not talking about revenue sharing, and I think it is important that the American public understands that, and I yield again to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Well, the gentleman may be disappointed he yielded. We have had our discussions and our debates about revenue sharing, but I think we are pretty close together.

As long as the money—it is kind of interesting. Revenue sharing is kind of like the impression is we are sharing with the rest of the country. It is kind of like they are sharing with us. The money comes from there in the first place, but, as long as the money is coming from the local communities and it is coming to Washington, then we are sending it back to them, I think it is important that we send it back with some broader goals, and some criteria and some measurements so they can drive toward successful programs. I think what my colleague from California was pointing out so correctly, we

are not taking away the criteria, and the goals and the objective measurements, but what we are doing with block granting is we are putting in place a lot more flexibility for the people in Holland, MI; Muskegon, MI; or Ludington, communities in my district, versus communities in your district, versus communities in California, to take these dollars, take a look at the broad objectives and goals that we think they should be striving for and put the programs together to go after meeting those objectives. What we want to eliminate, and you know we had the hearings a couple of weeks ago talking about values, schools, and parents, and Bill Bennett came and testified, and he seemed to imply, and I think we going to do some followup work on this with our staff and research with the people in the Education Department that the 6 percent of dollars, the education dollars that are coming from Washington at the elementary-secondary level, that when those dollars go back to the community, the belief is that maybe they go back with too many strings attached, too many rules and regulations, so that what happens at the local level is administrators and teachers are looking to Washington for their direction in what they should be doing when really, as Mr. Bennett said, great schools, effective schools, are those that are forming a partnership with the parents in the community in talking together with about here collectively our goals and our objectives for your kids, and we are going to work together on reaching those, and what you have here is when the dollars start coming from Washington with rules and regulations, all of a sudden the administrators are looking somewhere else about what they should be doing, and what rules and regulations they should be following, and we are detracting away from their primary focus. Their primary focus should not be filling out paperwork for bureaucrats in Washington. Their primary focus should be dealing with parents in the community, in dealing with the kids in the classroom and meeting their needs, and not trying to meet the needs of detailed rules and regulations from people that cannot even find our districts on a map.

Mr. GOODLING. And what they are looking at most and what detracts them most is that they are worried about the audit because, if they commingle one penny, they are in trouble, yet they know that here are 10 small categorical programs and they are accomplishing nothing. They could put some of those together, and commingle that money and produce good programs that are effective for that particular area, but they cannot do it because the auditor will be there.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Block grants are a positive thing because they will get rid of rules and regulations, they will be broad objectives, and it will return the primary focus back to the kids and getting them educated, and the adminis-

trators will spend more time worrying about what is happening in the classroom and less time about what is, or less time worrying about what is going to happen when the people in Washington review our documents.

It is a constructive change, it is a positive change, it is moving control back to where it should be.

Mr. GOODLING. I would like to very quickly review one other area that does not deal with education, but, you know, every time we come here we hear somebody get up and say, "Oh, you're taking from the poor and you're giving to the rich with your tax program," and I will come down every time, I will challenge them, tell them exactly what is in the tax bill. They will never get up and rebut it, but the next day they will come and say the same thing over and over again.

And so I come down, and I say, "Is a \$500 tax credit for long-term-care insurance, is that something for the rich?" Every senior citizen is worried out there about what happens if I have a lengthy illness.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is not every senior citizen, it is every one of us is worried about.

Mr. GOODLING. But this is one where the \$500 credit for long-term care cannot be for the rich. A thousand dollars for home care where every senior citizen wants to stay and where it is so much cheaper for everyone to have them, and is that for the rich? Of course not.

Is a correction of the marriage penalty for the rich? Of course not.

Is a \$2,000 IRA for the parent that stays home with their children for the rich? Of course not.

Up to \$5,000 credit for adoption? Is that for the rich?

A \$500 credit; now here they like to play with this one, for each child under 18, but 35 percent of all of those dollars go to a family of four with an income of \$30,000 or less. The next 35 percent goes to \$50,000 or less. Again, something for the rich?

Capital gains. Sixty-five percent of all capital gains transactions are brought about by senior citizens, and, therefore, if some senior citizen wants to take care of themselves in their golden years, and they have to sell their property, sell their farm, between State and Federal government will take 60 percent of everything, and then we will create programs down here to send money out to try to take care of the very people whose money we took from them and brought it down here.

So again the whole package was built around how do you keep the family, the struggling young family, together, and what can you do to get small business to create more jobs, because if our welfare program works, we need those jobs, and we need them to create them.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. And I believe that it is not like our tax revenues are going to go down—I mean and let us

see. We have got \$175 billion deficit or a \$160 billion deficit, and this year we spent \$1.5 trillion, so our tax revenues must have been about \$1.325 trillion, a lot. But \$1.3 trillion rounding. In 7 years, we are going to have a balanced budget, we are going to do the positive kinds of tax reforms that you are talking about, and what is our revenue going to be? It will be \$1.85 trillion. Tax revenues are going to go up, and they are going to go up significantly over the next 7 years even though we have made these tax reforms, so it is not like we are sitting here on a diet saying, "Oh, boy, we're not going to be getting as much money in." We are going to be getting a lot more money and we are going to be getting almost \$500 billion more per year into Washington in taxes in 7 years than what we are collecting this year.

Some tax cut.

Mr. GOODLING. Yes.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIGGS. I just want to make a couple of other quick points, Mr. Speaker, because I came across some information that I think answers some of the rhetorical questions we were raising earlier. I want to point out to our colleagues, our constituents, our listeners that a lot of the Federal funding on education in recent years has gone to fuel a large bureaucracy back here known as the U.S. Department of Education, and I am going to introduce a couple of articles for the RECORD, but I want to point out according to a couple of articles from Investors Business Daily. Since its creation in 1979 the Education Department has doubled in size from \$14.2 to \$32.9 billion today, 1995. That is three times the growth rate of all other discretionary nondefense programs in the Federal budget. In the past 5 years, the Education Department has grown from 4,596 bureaucrats and 155 programs to 5,100 bureaucrats and more than 240 programs, and that is, as you pointed out earlier, Mr. Speaker, that is just the U.S. Department of Education. That does not include the 30 other Federal agencies which spend more than \$27 billion on 308 education programs that the General Accounting Office deemed often duplicative and overlapping.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would yield, we are working on this project to define or redefine the role of the Education Department in the future, and I think, as the staff, the committee has gone through that number you quoted, \$27 billion in spending on education outside of the Education Department. I believe that the staff has come up with a number that says that number is closer to \$80 to \$100 billion. But that is the problem. We do not know where all of this money is which may be job security for me, but I think there is a role for oversight, significant oversight, and you know we have had some—we have had some very good hearings in trying to track down that

kind of money, having the kind of expertise that my colleague from California and the enthusiasm that he brings for this issue I think means that we are going to have a good opportunity to manage our growth and significantly increase our effectiveness as we go through what is a more difficult process than I believe it has to be of trying to balance the budget.

□ 2045

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will yield again, and I thank the gentleman for his comments, I want to introduce for the RECORD a commentary published in the American Legion magazine entitled "The Wrong Answer: Washington's movement toward centrally run, politically correct, 'no-fault' education proves the government is out of touch with what America wants from its schools," by Bruno V. Manno, the former U.S. assistant secretary of education for policy and planning, now a senior fellow at the Washington, DC, office of the Hudson Institute, and also an associate director of the Hudson's Modern Red Schoolhouse project, which I think attests to what the gentleman from Michigan was saying. In fact, I would change that subhead to say "This idea of federalizing education in this country proves that the government is out of touch with what American parents and guardians want from its schools."

I wanted to make one other point, though, because it is crucial to the debate we are going to have here over the next couple of days on the House floor. That is the District of Columbia public schools. I think it is a real concern for all of us. One of my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. WOLF], who represents a northern Virginia suburban district, has called the situation in D.C. public schools a disgrace and a tragedy. He has suggested that no Member of Congress would willingly send their children to attend District of Columbia public schools. I would point out that the President and the Vice President, who can obviously afford to send their children to private schools, so those children do not have to attend the District of Columbia public schools, do so.

I want to point out that Washington students consistently score the worst in the Nation, lower than any other inner-city group on the national education assessment progress test. And here is truly a shocking figure: Only 56 percent of city students even graduate high school. In recent weeks, we have seen newspaper articles appearing in the local media. Here is one from the Washington Post. I believe I have it here, if I can find it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman is looking for it, I might point out that the per pupil expenditure is one of the highest in the country.

Mr. RIGGS. In the range of \$8,000 to \$9,000 per pupil annually. Here is an ar-

ticle in the December 9 Washington Post, and the headline says, "Third Graders Mark Time During Parade of Teachers; D.C. Class Settles Down With Fourth Substitute." And we hear these stories of kids who do not have permanent teachers, who lack just basic education equipment, they lack proper textbooks, we hear horror stories, literally, of rundown facilities, facilities that do not have working plumbing, working, operating bathrooms. It is just really a crime and disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, we have passed, as an amendment to the District of Columbia annual appropriations bill, the D.C. School Reform Act. That originated, of course, with the efforts of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GOODLING], the efforts of our colleague on the Committee on Educational and Economic Opportunities, Mr. GUNDERSON; the D.C. School Reform Act will establish a challenging economic core curriculum in the District of Columbia public schools and provide scholarships for low-income families so they have the same right of choice across all competing educational institutions, public and private, as more affluent families.

It establishes independent public charter schools, expanded parent literacy schools, a work force preparation initiative, and it spends money to improve the District of Columbia school facilities. That particular amendment, which again was attached to the District of Columbia annual appropriations bill, has caused a great deal of controversy in this House. It has actually held up final passage of the District of Columbia appropriations.

I hope that we can make good on our commitment to the young people, the students of the District of Columbia public schools, because this is one case where a school district is, in fact, under our direct oversight by virtue of our being Members of Congress, and I appreciate the chairman of the committee not only taking the initiative tonight on this special order, but for all the work he has done to demonstrate his concern for the District of Columbia and to try to improve the caliber of District of Columbia schools.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the articles referred to earlier:

[From Investor's Business Daily, Nov. 21, 1995]

THE FEDERALIZATION OF EDUCATION?

CLINTON WANTS WASHINGTON IN CHARGE OF SCHOOLING

(By Matthew Robinson)

President Clinton's latest line in the sand in the budget battle is education spending.

Clinton considers his education policies one of his greatest achievements. He cites Goals 2000 and expansion of the federal student loan program as too important to trim.

But Clinton is facing a GOP just as steeled to reform the education status quo as he is bent to defend it.

The budget battle represents two different views of the federal government's role in education. Clinton wants to preserve his education policies which broaden federal power.

The GOP wants to send education back to the states.

A look at the numbers shows that Clinton's favorite education programs not only have failed to deliver better-educated kids, they have undermined traditional state authority.

To address this, the GOP is seeking changes in federal education programs, which have been the fastest-growing items in the federal budget.

In total, Washington spends about \$70 billion a year on education programs, according to the General Accounting Office.

Since its creation, the Education Department's budget has more than doubled from \$14.2 billion in 1980 to \$32.9 billion in 1995.

In the past five years, the Education Department has grown from 4,596 bureaucrats and 155 programs to 5,100 bureaucrats and more than 240 programs.

The House wants to cut \$3.6 billion from the Education Department, and the Senate want \$2.9 billion in cuts.

Despite his line in the sand, Clinton also called for a drop of \$2.2 billion in education outlays in his 1996 budget.

Federal education spending also has risen dramatically relative to other discretionary spending since 1979, according to John Berthoud, vice president of the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution, a think tank in Arlington, Va.

In the '70s, inflation-adjusted federal education spending grew only about half as fast as other non-defense discretionary spending items (35% vs. 65.4%).

But with the creation of the Education Department, federal education spending surged—rising three-and-a-half times as fast as the non-defense discretionary budget (29.5% vs. 7.9%).

And it's not just the department. Some 30 other federal agencies spend more than \$27 billion on 308 education programs that the GAO deemed often "duplicative and overlapping."

Despite the surge in federal spending, educational achievement barely roes. Average SAT scores rose just 1.1% during the '80s. And in more than a third of the states, scores fell.

"We have been throwing an endless stream of dollars at education with ever diminishing results," Berthoud said.

Still, the president has staked a lot on Goals 2000: The Educate America Act. The legislation builds on ideas begun in the Bush administration. It provides aid to states to develop education reform plans and implement "voluntary federal standards."

The president asked for \$750 million—an increase of more than 87% over fiscal year '95—to finance the program. By 2002, total funding for Goals 2000 would reach \$896 million.

But House Republicans have chosen to zero out Goals 2000. The Senate has opted to keep some of Goals 2000, cutting only \$62 million—a drop of 16.6% from the 1994 budget.

When compared to a federal budget of more than \$1.5 trillion dollars, Goals 2000—even if fully funded—is hardly a drop in the bucket.

PHILOSOPHICAL DIRECTION

And the federal share of education pales next to state and local shares. The U.S. spends about \$484 billion a year on education at all levels—7.6% of the GDP. The federal share comes to about 6%.

It isn't just the funding that bothers Republicans, it's the philosophical direction of Goals 2000.

The House, driven by the New Federalists, a group of about 50 Republican freshmen, chose to eliminate it.

Goals 2000, critics note, aims at raising national standards and performance. But it

does so by expanding the federal presence in education, even though supporters claim the federal standards are voluntary.

Some of the controversial elements include:

Goals 2000 uses the command "will" more than 45 times when describing what states must do to receive federal money. The word "should" is only used three times.

States must submit plans to federal education officials showing how they will accomplish the national education goals.

Once a state accepts Goals 2000 money, it must implement the program's requirements or be subject to federal action. Thus, a local charter school free from state regulations would have to answer directly to the federal government.

Tests used to evaluate students are based on criteria such as self-esteem and thinking ability, not factual knowledge. A typical question on such tests is: "What are your feelings after reading this?" The answers may include "symbols, images and drawings" in place of words.

Curricula and textbooks must fulfill federal specifications including "gender equitable and multicultural materials."

Controversial history standards that critics say are politically biased also are an outgrowth of the Goals 2000 reforms.

But the federal guidelines don't stop there, critics say. So intrusive are these measures, said Edward Kealy, director of Federal Programs for the National School Boards Association, that "I do not think any (corrective action) is left off the list short of a nuclear attack on school districts."

It boils down to one issue, others say. "Ultimately, it is an issue of local control," said Natalie Williams, an education specialist with the Claremont Institute, a California-based think tank. "Goals 2000 purports to be a wonderful reform measure. However, the GOP is looking to reform schools by freeing up schools with charters and restoring local control."

"It is tempting to look at Goals 2000 money and not see the implications. It's stifling creative reform efforts," Williams added.

The education establishment is up in arms at the GOP efforts to stop Goals 2000 before it gets started. The National Education Association, a union representing 2.1 million of the nation's teachers, has started a campaign to block the Republican budget plans.

HYPERBOLIC RHETORIC

Declares one NEA press release: "(T)he sound of the school bell is being drowned out by the growing roar of a chainsaw as Congress hacks billions of dollars from education to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy and giveaways to big business. As the school year begins, vital education programs are on the chopping block as never before."

Dale Lestina, senior lobbyist for the NEA is just as blunt. "Both the House and Senate proposals are poison to education. One just kills it a little faster. The Senate version is a little slower, but it'll still kill the program."

The GOP also wants to reverse Clinton's changes in student aid. Such aid is still a mainstay of the Education Department, with some 40% of its spending devoted to it.

The department spends about \$12 billion a year to make more than \$32 billion in grants, loans and work-study programs available to 6.5 million students—nearly half of the nation's college and university population.

Clinton has pointed to this program as an example of "investing in the next generation." To do so, he pushed through a change in student aid, from federally backed private lending to direct government lending.

Yet his direct lending program has not produced the savings he promised.

By eliminating the free-market lenders and administering the loans directly, the government hoped to save \$5 billion.

But according to the Congressional Budget Office, the White House plan has cost \$1.5 billion to administer.

Republicans plan on shifting the burdens back onto the private lenders who benefit from the loans. They predict a savings of \$10 billion.

The GOP desire for local control has even led to the first voucher-like initiative in the District of Columbia.

The House's D.C. appropriations bill approves \$3,000 scholarships for parents to choose the schools their children attend, whether public or private.

Washington students consistently score the worst in the nation—lower than any other inner-city group on the National Education Assessment Progress tests. Only 56% of city students even graduate high school.

But these arguments may soon become moot. In many states, there is a growing resolve to reject Washington money. States want to proceed with their own reforms free of federal red tape.

Montana, Virginia, New Hampshire and Alabama have all declined Goals 2000 money. And in California Gov. Pete Wilson's office, a debate rages about whether to accept \$42 million of Goals 2000 funding.

Not all Republicans want to trim the federal role in education.

Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania helped save Goals 2000 in the Senate, fighting to keep \$300 million in funding. His office also has been urging states to take the money and promising changes when state officials balked.

Even with the budget impasse, education reform is coming.

IN THE CROSSHAIRS

Ever since President Reagan promised to abolish the Education Department, conservative Republicans have had their sights set on the department.

The Back to Basics Education Reform Act, a measure introduced by Ohio Republican Steve Chabot, a former school teacher, would abolish the department.

It also would send \$9 billion in block grants to the states for elementary and secondary education and provide \$2 billion for higher education.

Student loans, Pell Grants and the Individuals with Disabilities Act programs would be moved to the Department of Health and Human Services.

The bill has 120 cosponsors and is expected to reach the House floor for a vote next year.

[From Investor's Business Daily, Nov. 27, 1995]

EDUCATION BAIT AND SWITCH

The program encourages states to adopt "voluntary federal standards" to qualify for new federal grants. Clinton wants to boost funding to \$700 million—almost double last year's \$370 million. The Senate wants to spend 16.6% less than last year. The House wants to zero out the program.

Its backers call Goals 2000 the most important education reform in three decades. But four states have already said "No," and California may join them. Virginia, Montana, New Hampshire and Alabama have rejected more than \$11 million of Goals 2000 funds.

Yes, it's a drop in the bucket. Virginia spends more than \$6 billion a year on education. Montana spends more than \$700 million. New Hampshire \$980 million and Alabama \$2.8 billion.

The states, which all have Republican governors, say they're rejecting the federal intrusion and "potential interference" in state authority. Alabama Gov. Fob James com-

plained that Goals 2000 doesn't move in the "direction of decreasing the role of the federal government and returning power to the states."

California Gov. Pete Wilson, who said last month that he would "probably not" accept \$42.1 million in Goals 2000 money, has the same beef. Goals 2000 is an intrusive measure filled with a "myriad of federal dictates" that may lead to the "federal micromanagement of California's education policy."

Goals 2000 backers say it has some of the "most flexible requirements" of any education act ever handed down from Washington. And it began at the initiative of the nation's governors, back in 1989. Why are they turning down what they asked for?

In fact, it's the same old Washington bait-and-switch. The standards are only voluntary if you turn down the money. Take it, and you're under the thumb of a half-dozen new bureaucracies and research institutions. You have to submit plans to the federal government to show how you'll reach Goals 2000 standards.

The passages on what states that take the funds must do uses the command "will" 45 times, and "should" just thrice.

Most important, Goals 2000 isn't really what the governors asked for. It doesn't boost education standards. It boosts education bureaucrats who will just add "standards" to their jargon, and go on as before.

This establishment is run by union bosses, administrators, and education professors who never master any other subject. Classroom teachers have next to no voice.

Since its creation in 1979, the Education Department has doubled in size, from \$14.2 billion to \$32.9 billion in 1995. That's three times the growth rate of all other discretionary, non-defense programs. Nationally, inflation-adjusted per pupil spending grew 35% from 1979 to 1992.

And all that bought us is a 1.1% increase in SAT scores.

Paul Gagnon, a former director of the Education Department's Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching, considers the problem in the December issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*. He looks at the debacle of another Education Department attempt to fulfill the governors' mandate—the effort to write national content standards.

Education hired scholars and teachers to write the humanities standards. They failed miserably. The English project was suspended after spending more than \$900,000. One subcommittee voted that the phrase "standard English" be replaced by "privileged dialect."

The history standards won headlines for their relentless pursuit of political correctness. At 314 pages, the experts' "outline" of world history is longer than many textbooks. And it emphasizes everything but the foundations of Western culture and thought.

The problem, writes Gagnon, is that the education establishment has opposed real standards for over a century. As a result, we write off 80% to 90% of all kids as unable to learn the basics of citizenship and success.

The nation does need education reform, and it would be worth higher spending. There's even room for a healthy federal role.

But Goals 2000, like most other current federal "reform" efforts, only buys more red tape, bureaucracy and double-talk. It's an investment in failure.

[From the American Legion, Dec. 1995]

THE WRONG ANSWER (By Bruno V. Manno)

She is a 10-year-old blank slate sitting with hands clasped in a classroom in Anytown, USA. Her brown eyes are large and

luminous, her long dark hair is tied behind her in a satin bow. Perhaps she is your daughter, or granddaughter, or niece.

What she learns here will determine how she sees the world and her place in it. Naturally you are concerned. You want to know that her schooling will equip her to compete. You want to know what she is being told about life and living.

About all, you want to know who is making the decisions that determine what she thinks about life.

Although there have been myriad debates about the "meaning" of the election of November 1994, this much is known: The American people used the ballot to express discomfort—if not outright disgust—with the government's paternalistic role in their daily lives. At a time when Washington's role in education has been steadily growing, this raises a number of serious questions about U.S. education policy.

Can Washington do right by the nation's nearly 50 million school kids?

Are the aims of Washington out of tune with the aims of America-at-large?

What should be done to resolve this disparity?

The answers are "perhaps," "quite probably," and "listen to the people."

The Clinton administration's elementary and secondary educational policies are packaged in a comprehensive two-part education overhaul known as Goals 2000 (the Educate American Act) and HR 6 (the Improving America's School Act). Together, these two pieces of 1994 legislation represent a vigorous and misguided attempt to centralize and standardize what this country does in education.

Most of the administration's agenda is a throwback to the mid-60's "Uncle Sam knows best" policies of the Great Society. It imposes nationwide a single education game plan, so-called "systemic reform." It maximizes Uncle Sam's role in the classroom and minimizes the role of communities and parents by tying federal education funds to the states' willingness to embrace Goals 2000 and the HR 6 agenda.

This Washington-knows-best education policy has several serious flaws. First, it downplays the academic results students achieve—"outputs"—in favor of such "inputs" as school spending, class size, and other resources or money issues. It thus shifts the focus of national education reform from what children learn, to what bureaucrats spend (once more assuming that the way to fix a problem is to throw money at it). This approach, of course, has almost nothing to do with the content of what is taught, or how it is taught, to that little dark-haired girl and her millions of classmates nationally.

This leads us to flaw number two. The Clinton approach gives far greater clout to education "experts" at the national level, while slighting civilian consumers such as parents and elected officials. For starters, Goals 2000 establishes a National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC). This new bureaucracy, comprising powerful interest groups, is akin to a national school board. NESIC, could, for example, set national standards for what kind of technology classrooms should have, what teaching methods are best for students, what training programs are best for teachers, or other controversial issues.

The danger here is amply demonstrated by the firestorm ignited by the debut of the new national history standards. In a now-famous essay for the *The Wall Street Journal*, former National Endowment for the Humanities chairman Lynne V. Cheney attacked them as "politicized history; [they] tend to save their unqualified admiration for people,

places and events that are politically correct." To a lesser degree, the political correctness of Goals 2000 even seeped into its science curricula.

Meanwhile, HR 6's "Gender Equity Act" mandates "gender sensitivity [and] gender-equitable practices." This approach is a supposed remedy for an alleged "academic gender gap" that is based on discredited research. It may earn political capital for its authors, but will do little to promote quality education.

Finally, the Clinton plan bans the use of federal money to develop or administer the sorts of "high stakes" tests that should be used by states and districts in making major decisions about student promotion, graduation and employment. This reinforces and accelerates the slide toward no-fault education which began a few decades ago with the advent of "gradeless" classes. It also undermines those few aspects of Goals 2000 that are worth supporting. For example, it advocates establishing voluntary standards in such core academic areas as math, science, English, history and geography.

We are left with a system of education that neither penalizes failure nor rewards success—this, in the name of protecting kids' feelings or "safeguarding the civil rights" of low-achievers.

In sum, the new laws are little more than a Washington power-grab in which Uncle Sam appears on the doorstep of local communities and states bearing gifts. But gifts from Washington seldom come without strings, and this is no exception. The inevitable result will be more federal red tape imposing rules and regulations on parents, teachers and communities that "can't be trusted" to decide what is best for their own children.

What makes all this more than mildly ironic is that the American people apparently feel it's Uncle Sam himself who can't be trusted.

Today, public confidence in Washington is at the lowest it has been in 36 years of survey research. That's the sober verdict of the most comprehensive examination ever undertaken of the "American dream," done for the Hudson Institute's Project on the New Promise of American Life.

The Hudson survey reveals that only 2 percent of Americans trust Washington to do what's right "all the time," and just 14 percent "most of the time." Incredibly, more than one in five trust our federal government to do the right thing "almost none of the time."

Also revealing was the survey's examination of which government branch or level has, or should have, the most power. While 55 percent believe Congress has the most power, only 29 percent believe that's the way things ought to be. Conversely, while 41 percent believe that states and localities should have the most power, fewer than 10 percent think that situation actually exists. These basic findings hold across all demographic lines.

Put simply, the vast majority of us believe that things are precisely ass-backwards when it comes to the distribution of power and influence. Washington is on a collision course with what most Americans want.

These facts take on added meaning as we examine more specifically what Americans expect of their public schools: According to a poll released by the Phi Delta Kappa education publication and the Gallup Organization:

Americans rank education at or near the top among national priorities.

Almost 90 percent say that developing the world's best education system is essential to America's future. Indeed, support for education as a No. 1 priority exceeds support for industrial development (60 percent) or the military (40 percent).

Americans want meaningful, measurable standards.

Eighty-one percent think schools should conform to national achievement standards and goals, with 70 percent supporting the standardized "high stakes" national tests eliminated under the Clinton plan.

Americans want key decisions about education made locally.

Some 77 percent of us want federal agencies to give local authorities more, not less, say in spending tax money from Uncle Sam, and 62 percent advocate families choosing which public schools their kids attend. Minorities—the people the new Clinton plan is trying to be "sensitive" to—are among the staunchest backers of school choice, and respective figures of 70 percent for blacks, 66 percent for Hispanics.

Another poll by the prestigious Public Agenda foundation showed:

Americans want no-nonsense schools where kids must show what they've learned before they can move on.

Fully 81 percent support student promotion only when a child has demonstrated mastery of what he's already been taught. Indeed—far from the Clinton notion of making school easier—more than three-quarters of Americans want teachers to toughen grading and be more willing to fail high-school students. Further, 76 percent say high-school diplomas should never be given to students who can't write and speak English well. (That this should even be a topic for discussion is a sad commentary on the state of education and society in general.)

The bottom line? The American public wants safe, orderly schools where discipline is enforced and students master "the basics" before promotion. As the Public Agenda poll itself puts it, Americans "seem to want a new and improved version of the little red schoolhouse."

The stark contrast between this report, and the beliefs espoused by the "experts" who are shaping national education policy, shows just how out of sync Washington is.

What does all this mean for Congress as it looks anew at education?

Elected officials should begin with the premise that local education can't be fixed in Washington. Accordingly, the 104th Congress should:

Undo the worst damage. That is, repeal the most damaging provisions of both the Goals 2000 and HR 6 federal power grabs.

Abolishing NESIC is a start. This would remove the "experts" from the driver's seat of a centralized national education policy. In fact, Congress should bar the federal bureaucracy from doing almost anything that interferes with local control of standards, curricula, testing and teaching.

Eliminate, too, all criteria that value money over marks. Don't judge progress by the amount of money a school district spends on education, but by the kinds of grades students are getting. This, of course, means overturning the provisions that frown upon the use of tests. In the final analysis, how do you really determine how well students are doing without them?

Congress also should take a clear position that true civil-rights enforcement means protecting the rights of all individuals as individuals. Enforcement should not be based on contrived gender-equity research, so-called "race norming" that "adjusts" test scores for characteristics such as race and poverty, or any other form of civil-rights activism that benefits specific groups.

Send programs home. About \$10 billion in federal programs should be re-routed to the states, which can use the money to purchase needed services. Congress should consult with the nation's governors to fine-tune the details. The final package should eliminate

one-size-fits-all thinking and allow states and communities to decide what they want to do.

Eliminate the Department of Education. It sounds drastic—but with so many programs sent back to the states, there's no need for a cabinet-level agency. What remains could be housed in an independent agency with a White House adviser reporting to the President.

Washington, however, should continue support for some research and statistics activities, especially state, national and international comparisons of what students are learning so that information is available to report on the nation's progress in achieving its education goals.

The time has come for an arrogant and meddlesome Washington to divest itself and send education back to families, schools, communities and states. It's the will of the people. And our children will benefit immensely.

Mr. GOODLING. When I went with the Speaker to the town meeting downtown at one of the schools, my closing remarks to the audience were something like this: "We have a golden opportunity to help the children get a part of the American dream in the District of Columbia, but my fear is that adults will act like children and nothing will happen." I hope I am not prophetic. I hope we can get beyond that, but unfortunately, that is the way it looks at this particular hour on this particular day.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think it is all of our vision. I am glad my colleague, the gentleman from California, brought up the District of Columbia. I think it is our vision that when educators from around the country come to Washington, they stop coming here trying to get their piece of the pie, their piece of the dollars, and they come here so they can learn about the District that we have some oversight on and say, "Here is a district that we can learn from."

Our vision is to have a school district that is turning out well-trained, well-educated kids, that is the envy of other school districts around the country, so they come here not for money but they come to learn from the school district we have in Washington here. We do not know whether those reforms are going to work, but we recognize that we have to do something, and we think these are constructive approaches that we can experiment with, that hopefully will make things better, and again, we will do the normal thing. We will build off of those things that work and eliminate those things that do not, but we are going to keep plugging at this.

I thank the chairman for having this special order. I think we have been able to dispel some myths tonight and hopefully educate and share some knowledge with people.

Mr. GOODLING. Let me close by saying that there are two major responsibilities as far as the Federal Government is concerned in relationship to public education, because, as we all know, that is guarded very jealously by local communities and by States. There are two major responsibilities.

That is equal access to all for a good education, and the research that must be done.

I would appeal to the American public, please, encourage us, help us make the kind of reforms that have to be made if, as a matter of fact, quality is going to be the name of the game, rather than mediocrity. I appeal to all Americans, do not encourage us to continue the status quo, encourage us, as a matter of fact, as a body to bring about the necessary reforms so that quality in education, quality in job training, will be the goal that we reach and the goal that we attain.

I thank both of you very much for participating in this discussion.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN DINGELL ON HIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this evening to come to the floor to honor one of the truly great leaders that has served in this institution over the course of our noble history in this country.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud this evening to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to my good friend and mentor, the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL. All of us have favorite JOHN DINGELL stories, and let me just tell you quickly a story that I think just about says it all.

A few months ago when we were in the heat of the Medicare debate, I turned the TV on one morning on C-SPAN, and there was JOHN sitting in a committee meeting. He was reading our colleagues on this side of the aisle the riot act. A few hours later I looked again on C-SPAN and there was JOHN, standing up in front of a group of senior citizens at a press conference talking about Medicare. A few minutes later the House went into session and he was sitting here, in one of the front rows, and came up and gave a 1-minute speech on the Medicare plan. Later that day, during the debate, I looked up and there he was, giving a stirring speech in opposition to the nursing home cuts that were being proposed. At the end of the day I walked out of the House and there was the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, in front of the Capitol. He was talking to a group of constituents about this very

same issue. This all happened in a period of one day.

The next morning we were in Michigan and we had this bus tour, and it was a Medicare bus tour. We went to all these different cities in southeastern Michigan, my district and his district, SANDY LEVIN'S district, DALE KILDEE'S district, we went into the city of Detroit, JOHN CONYERS' district, to talk about Medicare.

I remember the first stop was in Pontiac. I thought, "Well, maybe I had better get there very early to make sure everything is going right." I got there, and I do not recall what time it was, but it was quite early in the morning. He was there before I was, and he was talking to some of the constituents in Pontiac about this issue. Not only did he speak at all six stops as we went throughout southeastern Michigan that day, he was the last one talking to the reporters when the day was over. I swear I expected to half see him driving the bus home at the end of the day.

I think that story says it all about JOHN DINGELL. After 40 years, my friend from the Dawn River area in Michigan is just as committed, he is just as passionate and just as dedicated to the working people that he represents as the day that he got here. I do not think I have seen a more energized and compassionate defense of working people from a Member of our party when we went into the minority this year, especially a senior Member, than I saw in JOHN DINGELL in the first 12 months of this new year. Minority status has not bothered him at all. He has been out there, he has been fighting, and I think that says a lot about his person, who he is, what he is about, and what he cares about.

For over 40 years, he has made a difference in more lives than I think virtually any other Member who has served in this great institution. I stand in awe of the legacy that he has for this great institution. If you look at what he has done, he was there for Medicare, he was there when Medicaid was established, he was there for the nursing home protection that we have in the institutions that house the elderly all over the country.

In the environmental area I had the good fortune to serve with JOHN on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when I first came to the Congress. We worked on many, many pieces of legislation back there to help clean up our environment. He has been there on the forefront of, of course, the Clean Air Act, the Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Alaskan lands bill, and in the environmental area he stands out as a giant in this country.

For those who have disabilities, he was there in championing, in leading the fight in his committee on the Americans with Disabilities Act; in his efforts to remove asbestos from our children's classrooms, to improve lab testing, to increase railroad safety, and to ensure that tax dollars are used