

bureaucracy. Today, that number has exploded up to \$33 billion. Let us make no mistake of it, I have children. I understand the importance of education. It is at the top of my list on issues that are important in this country. However, sending \$33 billion to Washington, D.C. for an education bureaucracy that has failed over the past 15 years simply is not the answer.

Look what has happened since 1980, since we went from spending \$14 billion on this new agency to \$33 billion in 1995. Test scores for reading and writing have plummeted, while funding has shot up for this bureaucracy. Test scores for arithmetic and science have stagnated, while funding for this Federal bureaucracy has skyrocketed. We are not getting the best bang for our buck.

When the President of the United States says to us that he needs more money for education, he is actually saying he needs more money for his Washington, D.C. education bureaucracy. Do not take my word for it. I ask you to take that education bureaucracy's word for it, and read their budget.

What would you think if you knew that the Department of Education was cutting \$100 million from schools' infrastructure programs across the country, \$100 million this year? They say they do not have the money, they do not have the money to keep your children's schools safe, they do not have the money to upgrade school systems to make sure that children can go to school in safe schools. They say "We are too financially constrained right now. We are going to have to cut \$100 million from the program to keep schools safe."

Then they turn around in that very same budget and say "We are going to increase spending by \$20 million for our own education bureaucracy, which sits a few blocks down from Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C."

□ 1630

Think about that. They are not robbing Peter to pay Paul. They are stealing from our schools in our hometown, to pour more money into their education bureaucracy building down the street.

Does that make sense? When the President says he needs more money for education and that is how education is defined in Washington DC, does that make sense? When your education dollars and my education dollars are not getting back to our children and to our teachers and to our principals and to our school boards and to our communities and to our hometowns and to our States but instead are strangled in the bureaucracy of Washington, DC, does that make sense? Is that the type of education policy we need to move into the 21st century, to help us compete in the 21st century workplace?

I do not think so. I know you do not think so. I certainly know that our Founding Fathers did not think so.

I carry with me a copy of the Constitution of the United States. If you want to know what our Founding Fathers thought about education, all you need to do is read the Constitution of the United States and specifically read the 10th amendment.

In the 10th amendment, it states all powers not specifically given to the Federal Government through the Constitution are reserved to the States and to the citizens.

What does that mean? It means if it does not say it in the Constitution, that this body, that this Congress, is not permitted to spend money on it, is not permitted to interfere in it, is not permitted to interfere in the education of citizens' children. That is why for almost 200 years we got by fine without a free-standing Department of Education bureaucracy. That is why we have gone from spending \$14 billion to \$33 billion and actually seen a decline in our educational standards, have seen drops in our test scores, have seen an increase in violence in schools, and have seen an increase in dropout rates when you start measuring those dropout rates with 8th grade students.

Mr. Speaker, we can do better, and we will. We are going to start doing better in the coming weeks as we introduce a bill to Congress that is called the Back to Basics Education Reform Act of 1995. Is that not really what it is all about, getting back to basics, moving away from the social engineering that we have been trying to accomplish and that we have failed on for the past 30 years? Would it not be great to get back to reading and writing and arithmetic and the basics?

Most importantly, would it not be great to once again allow parents and allow communities and allow hometowns to decide how to educate their children instead of having bureaucrats in Washington, DC decide without their input?

James Madison wrote over 200 years ago as he was framing the Constitution, "We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government but upon the capacity of each of us to govern ourselves, control ourselves and sustain ourselves according to the 10 Commandments of God."

It was Thomas Jefferson who said that the government that governs least governs best. Why did Jefferson say that? Did Jefferson say it because he was anti-government? No. Jefferson said it because he was pro-freedom, because he was pro-individual, because he was pro-States rights, because he believed, and James Madison believed, and our Founding Fathers believed, that when you allowed individuals and communities and States to experiment with education reform in the free marketplace of ideas that only the strong ideas would survive, that we did not need big brother and big sister telling us from Washington, DC, "This is the only way you can educate your children." It is time to move away from

that failed vision. We have tried it for over a generation now and we are getting nowhere with it. We need to move beyond and dare to experiment, to dare to give power back to the States and to the citizens where it belongs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, like many Americans believe, that we can have 50 State legislatures and Governors experimenting with education reform and we will have 50 legislative laboratories where only the strong ideas survive instead of being dictated from Washington, DC by a bureaucracy that says. "This is how you do it and if you don't do it this way, we're not going to send money back to your school communities."

"Oh, I understand we ripped money out of your communities, we took away education funding from your community and brought it up to Washington, DC, but we ain't giving it back unless you do A, B and C."

Let me tell you something, there is a new way to do things, and that is to do it the old way, the way that Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and our Founding Fathers intended. With the Back to Basics Education Reform Act, we are going to start down that path.

I ask you, when the President of the United States pleads for more education dollars, remember, he is not talking about education dollars for children, he is talking about education dollars for bureaucrats. We can do better and we will, and we must if we are going to compete in the 21st century.

SALUTE TO RICHARD E. FLUGE,
PRESIDENT, MONTGOMERY
COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to salute Richard E. Fluge, president of the Abington Township, Montgomery County Board of Commissioners who died suddenly this morning. It is a great loss for our country, because local government leaders like Richard Fluge are closest to the people, they see the problems first and they solve them best.

Mr. Fluge was one of the most inspirational local government leaders in the United States. He championed for many of the items that were passed in the contract:

The unfunded mandates. As president of the Board of Commissioners in Abington Township, Montgomery County, he knew how harsh the unfunded mandates were and the fact is that through his leadership, we no longer have Federal initiatives without money being sent from Washington.

He also championed for a balanced budget. Every other government, school, township, and States have to balance their budgets and now as a result of the House's action and hopefully we will have the Senate action as

well, a balanced budget will be a reality and the fiscal integrity that Richard Fluge championed for will be achieved.

He also worked for regulatory reform, to make sure we have less of the redtape in government and more of the services to the people.

He also worked to have a line-item veto, like 43 Governors and our President will soon have, to make sure we cut out the waste in Government action, the pork-barrel projects.

He also worked in long-range planning. Many people in government plan for today and do not work for tomorrow. Dick Fluge's idea was, let's look to a 5- and 10-year plan, where this country will be, where his community will be.

He also just recently attended a special Medicare preservation task force with the citizens to protect Social Security and Medicare in nearby Blue Ball, PA. There he spoke in behalf of senior citizens and protecting these important programs.

He was a role model, a visionary leader, honest, principled, fair, a great intellect, someone who was low-key, modest, and organized.

Mr. Fluge's type of leadership, his legacy that lives on will in fact be followed by those who follow in his footsteps. They will make great contributions like he has to our country.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, with these comments. One of his favorite quotes was, "If it's morally right, it's politically right."

He also quoted Dag Hammarskjold, former Secretary-General of the United Nations. When asked what direction this country and world were going, he said, "It's not north, not south, not east nor west but going forward."

And in reference to that, with leaders like Dick Fluge, who inspired us to do our best, we will go forward, to work together for the common good, who put service above self. The future of our country's progress is unlimited with people like Dick Fluge, who gave a great legacy of service.

HOUSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention, the Good Lord willing, to take an hour tomorrow in order to provide my latest report with respect to the very fundamental question of housing in our country.

But for the moment, I would like to report on a letter that I have addressed the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Charles Bowsher.

As you know, the GAO has provided me and the Subcommittee on Housing information and analysis with regard to the FHA single family mortgage insurance program. I am writing to request that the GAO conduct some further work and analysis in this area.

Let me interpose and interject a little report. Because there is no general widespread discussion or reporting on housing conditions in our country, the most pertinent and disturbing fact is that we still have, in the words of Franklin Roosevelt, in fact better than one-third of our Americans ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed in what we have all taken for granted to be a time of great abundance.

Unfortunately, as we have evolved historically, we have gone a long way in which I have always feared, and, that is, the Europe-ization or the stratification of our social elements, or classes, if you want to call them that.

It was always my hope and in fact I premised my aspirations, for without that, I would not be addressing my colleagues today, on the upward, free ability of movement of our general citizenry, where we have not become so strapped and so homogenized and stratified as in some of the older portions of the world, including Europe, where that is impossible.

If you are the son or the daughter of a street sweeper or even a humble shoemaker in most countries, including England, it will be very difficult for that son or daughter to be a doctor, or a dentist, or a lawyer.

□ 1645

That is because of the stratification that has come over the course of centuries in the class structure of those countries and societies.

This is our challenge, and will continue to be, and was foreseen; that as we emerged into the 20th century, that would be America's challenge.

Now, the basic elements and necessities of life for human beings has not changed. You have got to have clothing, you have got to have food, and you have got to have shelter.

In my congressional and even in my precongressional service, going to my earlier years in my home city of San Antonio, I concentrated on that one element known as shelter. And, as a matter of fact, in the State Senate, was the author of the general comprehensive housing and community laws that still are on the statute books in Texas of over 35 years ago.

And so, I am quite proud of that record, and I continued that endeavor and was very fortunate, upon arrival in the House, to be assigned to the Committee on Banking, which also has the Subcommittee on Housing and now known as Housing and Community Development.

At this time the Congress and the administration are considering changes in the FHA's organizational structure and its programs and authorities. FHA, and particularly with reference to the Single Family Mortgage Insurance Program, is one of the great contributions and breakthroughs in taking our people out of the submergence of bad housing, poverty, into our level that we have become accustomed to.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, June 15, 1995.

Hon. CHARLES BOWSHER,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BOWSHER: As you know, the GAO has provided me and the Subcommittee on Housing information and analysis with regard to the FHA single family mortgage insurance program. I am writing to request that the GAO conduct some further work and analysis in this area.

The Congress and the Administration currently are considering changes in FHA's organizational structure and its programs and authorities. In order to make the most informed decision about these proposals, we need to learn as much as possible about the current borrowers and activities of the FHA and their relationship to today's single family finance system. For this reason, I am requesting that the GAO provide me with information on differences and similarities between the FHA and private mortgage insurers. Specifically, I am interested in comparisons of the income and race of borrowers assisted by the FHA and private mortgage insurers, the income and racial characteristics of the neighborhoods in which these borrowers live, comparisons of product lines, and in any other information that might be helpful as we consider legislative proposals.

May I suggest that our respective staffs meet as soon as possible to establish a time frame for completing this work. If you have any questions concerning this request, please call me or have your staff call Nancy Libson of the Banking Committee staff at 225-7054.

I deeply appreciate the work the GAO has done for us and look forward to your insights once again on this important topic.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Ranking Member.

CLOSING THE BILLIONAIRE'S TAX LOOPHOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAUR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAUR. Mr Speaker, I will not take an hour's worth of time, but just a few minutes. I have asked for the time today to discuss an important development in the Committee on Ways and Means this week.

The committee took up the highly controversial expatriate loophole. This provision allows the super-rich of this Nation to dodge paying taxes by renouncing, they can actually renounce their U.S. citizenship.

And this is not something that is just a figment of my imagination. It is a loophole that has allowed billionaires such as the Campbell Soup fortune heir, John Dorrance III, and Dart Container Corp. president, Kenneth Dart, to avoid taxes by renouncing their U.S. citizenship.

Now, keep in mind that these are folks who made their fortunes in the United States on the backs of working men and women in this country. And they decide that they do not want to pay their taxes, so they renounce their citizenship and they go to live elsewhere.