

in Tailhook, and certainly those kinds of abuses have to be rooted out. But it is despicable to abandon due process, the chain of command and any sensible approach to fairness, ruining so many careers in the process.

The Stan Arthur case is a classic example, repealed hundreds of times at lesser and less visible grades. He flew more than 300 combat missions in Vietnam and led the Navy forces in Desert Storm. An impeccable career. A leader who really inspired young kids in the service. He was asked as vice chief to review a decision denying a female helicopter pilot her designation. He came to the conclusion that she could not meet the qualifications. For that he was cashiered, because everybody was afraid—afraid of Pat Schroeder and her McCarthyite slurs, afraid of the White House commissars, afraid of the media.

A DANGEROUS CALLING

The Navy is not just another bureaucracy in the government. Naval service is a dangerous calling that requires the highest professional standards to defend the U.S. and its interests. What an outrage that we are cashiering and promoting people based on reasons that have nothing to do with their readiness to fight the conflicts of this country.

Fifteen years ago and after, I came in for my share of abuse. But as a presidential appointee I was supposed to be politically accountable. Generally my successors and I give as good as we get: I for instance can afford libel lawyers. The new and ugly phase of recent years, however, has brought career officers into the line of fire for the first time—and a viciously personal fire it is. Career professionals are not prepared or trained for it, they lack the means to defend against it, and they don't deserve it. We can only hope that Mike Boorda's tragic death will awaken some basic decency in our leadership and the crusade will end before it does irreparable damage to our nation's defense.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, May 21, 1996]

MIKE BOORDA, RIP

We say "nuts" to the medals teapot; we're going to remember Admiral Boorda for what he did to the Serbs' jets.

Before he was called back to the Navy's CNO, Admiral Boorda was the commander of NATO forces in southern Europe, which is to say the top U.S. commander involved in the conflict in Bosnia. One day he found himself in authority, perhaps through some oversight at the U.N., just as Serbian jets were flouting the U.N.'s ban on their flights. So he ordered them shot down, just as they were starting bombing runs on population centers.

Similarly, when Cuban MiGs shot down American-owned planes over international waters, his first reaction, according to a good source, was: where are my Tomahawk shooters. In the end, of course, the U.S. did not launch Tomahawk cruise missiles at Cuban airfields, nor did the Boorda airstrike end the war in Bosnia. But shooting down four Serbian jets was the most vigorous action anyone at NATO or the U.N. took against a particularly disgusting aggressor.

Mike Boorda, in short, had more than the usual ration of political courage, which makes his suicide all the more perplexing and mysterious. By the weekend, the media had pretty much exhausted the tempest over the medals and got around to the main issue: Tailhook, and the pressures still radiating through the Navy under Commander in Chief Bill Clinton.

Good military officers don't shift blame for breakdowns on their watch, and Admiral Boorda bore the brunt for what the political furies of Tailhook did to the careers of Admiral Stanley Arthur, Commander Robert Stumpf and many others less prominent. The

legendary Admiral Arthur's promotion to the Pacific Command fell through on Admiral Boorda's watch. In an interview after he had agreed to pull the plug on the promotion, the CNO said: "Certainly Stan Arthur is paying a penalty. And the country's paying a penalty. He's not serving in a job where he would have been superb."

That incident is being revisited in the suicide's aftermath. The Navy command withdrew the nomination after Senator Dave Durenberger, of all people, made Admiral Arthur the target of feminists for supporting an instructor's decision that a female pilot was below standard and should not fly. In fact, the decision to wreck Admiral Arthur's career was assented to by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the Joints Chiefs and the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

This is the same Armed Services Committee, under Sam Nunn, that held a secret session to waive through the nomination of John Dalton to be Secretary of Navy amid questions raised about Mr. Dalton's dealings during the 1980s in the Texas S&L industry. Mr. Dalton, who later worked for Stephens Inc. of Arkansas, vehemently denies any wrongdoing, and the solons of the Senate get red-faced at the suggestion that they gave Mr. Dalton special treatment. And indeed it's not a widely known story. But ask the next Naval officer you meet if he knows about it.

This year, with Tailhook's eternal bonfire still burning, Secretary Dalton withdrew the promotion of Commander Robert Stumpf, even after his own investigation had cleared the commander of any Tailhook taint. Admiral Boorda was on the bridge for that one, too. Earlier in the process, Admiral Boorda tried to help Commander Stumpf, but he couldn't. Instead he was directed to withdraw Commander Stumpf's nomination. When asked this Sunday morning about his department's handling of these personnel matters, Navy Secretary Dalton said, "I feel good about the decisions we've made."

The attitude within the Navy is no doubt captured by former Navy Secretary John Lehman in his article nearby. James Webb, another former Secretary, delivered a searing speech at the Naval Academy last month, speaking of "the destruction of the careers of some of the finest aviators in the Navy based on hearsay and unsubstantiated allegations." He wondered "what admiral has had the courage to risk his own career by putting his stars on the table, and defending the integrity of the process and of his people?"

For some reason, this country does not have a tradition of honorable resignation on principle, as exists elsewhere. America's government is a huge and hugely powerful force, and its high officials, even as they disagree bitterly, tend to let it sweep them forward. It might be healthier for all if on occasion they said what they truthfully felt, and quit.

Admiral Boorda left behind a single-page note addressed to "the sailors." The Pentagon's story is that releasing this note is a decision for the family, and sympathy for their tragedy is appropriate. The fact remains that the Navy as an institution has been rocked to its foundations, and if Mike Boorda had something to say about that, everyone serving in the Navy should be entitled to read it.

Today there will be a memorial service for Admiral Boorda, and President Bill Clinton will deliver the eulogy over his career and life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EDUCATION CAUCUS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, tonight I rise to talk about an issue that every person in America, every person in this Congress, has a great interest in, and that is the issue of education.

We often talk about the need to provide a college education to our children across this country, and Members of this Congress, about 72 in number, decided to come together to form something called an Education Caucus. Members of the House, as well as Members of the Senate, decided that for the first time in this Congress, we needed to concentrate our efforts on a group of people who believe that we should push education forward in this country, should meet as a caucus, and organize as a caucus, and push legislation and appropriations as relates to education in both the House and the Senate.

I am very pleased that so many Members of this Congress have decided to participate in this caucus and to move it forward, and tonight, I am just making a simple plea to all Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle to take an interest and to join a caucus that we consider to be one of the caucuses of the future of this Congress, a caucus that believes in bipartisanship because education is an issue that both Democrats and Republicans can agree on.

I would like to mention that Senator WELLSTONE will be chairing the caucus, co-chairing the caucus with myself. Senator WELLSTONE has been working very diligently in the caucus on the Senate side, and we have now organized such that we have even a whip operation in the caucus, and tonight I want to talk about some of those national organizations who are concerned about

education, who met at our very first meeting, and who talked about the concerns of education in this country.

We are very pleased, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that on the 16th of May several education groups embarked upon this Capitol to talk about the children and to talk about how we prepare for their future and to talk about how we, as Members of Congress, could make an impact on their future by improving the quality of education in this country, elementary on up to higher education.

We have caucuses in this Congress for almost everything. We have a Sun Belt Caucus, we have a caucus for peanuts, a caucus for cotton, a caucus for almost every issue that you can imagine. But I thought it was somewhat strange that we did not have a caucus for education, and these individuals for the first time in years had the opportunity to sit and express their concerns before a group of people, lawmakers, about how they felt about education.

One individual, Mr. Speaker, was Ms. Scarlet Kelly who was the executive director of the National Community Education Association. She was able to come to that meeting and give us some insight in terms of what we should be doing as lawmakers to improve the quality of education, because all too often one of the things we fail to do is to get the input from teachers and from parents and from students themselves as relates to education. We often walk into the Halls of Congress and the halls of State legislatures, quite frankly, speaking across this country, and make very, very crucial decisions that affect education, and many times we fail to consult enough educators and enough parents and enough students and fail to involve them, in a real sense, in the process, and many times those decisions are not the best decisions because of lack of information.

Ms. Kelly was able to bring to the table some community aspect of education and how we can improve education by networking with the community. I am going to enter her testimony into the RECORD because I do think that people should know some of the things that we can do to improve education, and it should not always come from politicians and from lawmakers. It should come many times from people who do it on a day-to-day basis.

We also heard testimony from Mr. Joel Packard who has the senior professional association and governmental relations division for the National Education Association, the NEA. The NEA, as most of you know, has been very, very strong advocates of education in this country. They were pleased at the fact that Members on both sides of the aisle, both Democrats and Republicans, were coming together to talk about education, and he shared some very good information to each of us.

One of the things he wanted to make emphatically clear is that in order for this caucus to be effective, we had to pull from both sides of the aisle, and he

talked about how people should be able to rally around the issue of education.

I do not think there is a Member of this Congress who does not believe in education. I do not think there is a Member who is elected to public life, to be quite honest with you, who does not advocate a strong educational system and building educational systems, be it in a State through a State legislature or through a board of education, a State board of education, or be it in the U.S. Congress.

But we do differ, quite frankly, speaking in terms of how we meet that goal. We all have the same motive. We all, every Member of this Congress, I do not care if you are a Democrat, I do not care if you are a Republican, I do not care if you are from California or from New York; every Member of this institution believes that we need to provide kids with a quality education.

□ 2030

We all have the same motive. But many times we have different methods. I think one of the reasons why our methods are somewhat different is, and many times we find ourselves fighting on the floor of the House, is because we do not network enough. This caucus will provide an avenue for us to network and talk about some of our differences in terms of how we move education forward.

Joel Packer said it best. In order for us to get education moving, we cannot do it by bickering on the floor of the House. We have to do it by showing real leadership, because the individuals who are looking to us for leadership are the born and the yet-unborn who are in public schools and in private schools, and those who plan to attend colleges and universities across this country and who are dependent on many of our decisions in terms of how they finance their education, for example.

There are many students who want to go to college who do not have the money, and who do not necessarily want a grant. Some students have no problem with taking out a student loan, but those student loans ought to be available to those individuals who wish to seek a higher education. His testimony, Mr. Speaker, will be entered into the RECORD tonight as well.

We also heard from Ricki Rafel, who was a board member from the National Parent and Teachers Association. One of the great things about this caucus is we are going to include many groups from the outside. At the next caucus meeting we are going to talk to business people, because we know that business and education work hand in hand. No longer can businesses in this country not get involved in education, because it affects their business. There are too many businesses in this country who have to train workers, even after they finish college, in order to prepare them to do a day's work. So business realizes that there is a necessity to have a strong and quality edu-

cational system in each State and across this country.

Ms. Rafel talked about parental involvement. I am cognizant of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that it is not government's responsibility to raise children. It is the parents' responsibility to raise children. We should, in order to make education work, we should have a relationship between parents and teachers.

When I was growing up, my teacher knew my mother and my mother knew my teacher, and I as a student knew that the two knew each other. There is something different that takes place in the classrooms when parents and teachers know each other, and the student is cognizant of that fact. We need to bring about better parent and teacher relationships. We cannot do that through legislation. We cannot pass legislation and mandate that parents and teachers sign a covenant, but we can do it by including parents in the decisionmaking process, to make them a part of the process.

In this caucus meeting we had an opportunity to hear the parental side in terms of what parents think, what is going through the parents' minds, how can we improve the quality of education in this country, how can we make our schools safer, how can we give parents some sense of ease when they walk into their job and they have their loved one, their little child, their little 7-, 8-, 9-, 10-year-old in a school, how can we give them some comfort, to know that that child is not sitting next to a person who may have a gun?

So the parental aspect is so important. She had the opportunity to talk about how teachers and parents need to create a better marriage, because when we have a marriage between the two, then we can really get student involvement. We felt that her testimony was quite informative, and we certainly want to thank them for all the work that they are doing across the country.

The other organization we heard from, Mr. Speaker, was the National Head Start Association. Ms. Angelica Santacruz, who is the associate director of governmental affairs, she talked about the need for Head Start. I know Members of this Congress may have different opinions about the Head Start program, but this caucus will provide an opportunity for us to talk about it before we walk on the floor and vigorously oppose each other, be it appropriations or just be it philosophical, for philosophical reasons. I personally feel that Head Start is a very good thing. But we want more Members of this Congress to join the caucus so we can talk about it.

If there are real problems with full funding of Head Start, let us talk about them, because each of us are committed to improving education in this country, and in order to do that we ought to have dialogue. That dialogue should not begin and end only on the floor of the House of Representatives. It ought to be that we ought to take the time to talk about it in other places, as well.

We also heard from Mr. Jerry Lewis, the director of TRIO. He also works at the University of Maryland with the National Council on Educational Opportunity Association. The TRIO program is a very worthwhile program, and we had the opportunity to hear success stories from this gentleman, because often we walk to the floor and we talk about TRIO funding, needing funding and not needing funding, but it gives you a different perspective when you actually have the opportunity to witness a person who teaches in a TRIO program, who teaches students in a TRIO program, and who has vast experiences and success stories.

I take a moment of personal privilege when we talk about TRIO, because I am a product of the TRIO program. I know what the TRIO program did for me. I know what it is doing for students all across this country and will do for students who have yet to enter the program. I personally feel it is a program that is much needed.

Oftentimes young people who are in high school look at college as a fear. There is a big fear factor in the minds of many young people. Before they take that step and enter a college campus, they need sometimes a little push. Many people are the first to graduate or to go to college. Many households, many kids come from large households and they may be the first person to enter college. The TRIO program takes away that fear, to a large degree.

I take myself as an example. I was afraid of college. I made very good grades when I was in high school, but I did not have a lot of people who lived next door to me who graduated from college, quite frankly speaking, so I did not know if college was the right thing or the wrong thing. I did not know if I could make it without a college education or not. I wanted to be a lawyer, but I did not have a lot of people who I could talk to about college.

I was afraid of college. To walk on a college campus with 10,000 people, leaving a high school with 600 was a big shift for me. But TRIO took me out of the high school on the weekends and put me in a college setting. I had an opportunity to be a college student as a high school student, so I was not fearful of college. I had an opportunity to learn about college while I was in high school, so I could not wait to graduate from high school so that I could enter college. It was no longer a fear factor for me.

Those real stories, those stories are not told on the floor of the House of Representatives, many times because we are under time restraints. For example, most of us, when we speak on major legislation, we have 1 minute, 30 seconds, 2 minutes. You cannot bring out those kinds of success stories, but we can do it in a caucus, and we can do it when Republicans and Democrats sit around a table and talk about programs, and not just look at it in terms of the bottom line in terms of numbers, but the bottom lines in terms of suc-

cess: what impact these programs are having.

We also heard testimony from Edward Kealy, who is a director of the Committee for Educational Funding. He also spoke of the need for the caucus to be bipartisan, how we need to bring Members from both sides of the aisle together to talk about education, because if there is one issue that we all agree on in terms of whether or not we should have a good system, it is education. I am happy that we have a number of Republicans and Democrats who have joined the caucus and encouraged them to continue to participate.

Mr. John Forkenbrock, who is the executive director of the National Association of Federally-Impacted Schools, shared a lot of economic information, talked about how Federal funds are needed for many of the schools. Many times we look at it from a bottom line perspective in terms of dollars, and in terms of how we balance budgets and how we can make everything add up, but he actually gave some real meaning to the need for the Federal Government to be involved in the education of his children.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, we heard from Marilyn Aklon, executive director of the National Coalition of Title I—Chapter 1 Parents, a program that many of us have debated quite profusely on the floor of this Congress. She was able to talk about the needs for the program and how we can in fact improve the program.

Members would be amazed at many of these individuals who came before the caucus on Thursday of last week, and how they were not individuals who walked into the caucus begging for more Federal funds, but in fact they were folk who wanted to really improve the quality of education for our children. That was very refreshing.

When we deliberate appropriations, this caucus may not have the kind of impact it should have on the 1997 budget appropriations for education, but budget is not the only thing. I do think there are many other things we can do to improve education other than money: teacher-parent relationships. That is a very good start.

To many of the members of the caucus, one of the things we will do is attend schools within our respective districts and try to do it on a weekly basis, or at least on a monthly basis, where we can walk into classrooms and actually talk to kids and talk to them about how we feel about education, and also talk about how individuals can in fact improve their own lives through education.

Mr. Speaker, we have established this caucus. I urge Members of this Congress to join the caucus. If there are Members who wish to be a member, wish to talk to our office a little bit more about the caucus, we will be happy to do that, and we certainly feel it is a worthwhile cause.

I see that I have been joined by two members of the caucus, the gentle-

woman from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Texas is my neighbor State, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. OWENS.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS]. I want to emphasize his continued leadership on this question of education, and am gratified at the formation of the Education Caucus and delighted to join him in its membership, in being a member of that caucus.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a very interesting point as I joined him. I could not help but here the very focused words that he offered about the priorities that this country has. He offered, first of all, to say that we recognize that money is not the answer always to education; that it includes a community partnership, not only with those that have children in the school system, particularly the public school system, but the broader community, the business community. It certainly involves the parents and a system that supports them in their efforts to support their children. There is something special about a parent asking a child about their homework. The child may think it is not very special, but it is important for that involvement to occur.

As I was listening to the gentleman further, he mentioned the responsibility, but also the importance of teachers and the recognition of their value by increased compensation, so that our young people who are in college can readily choose education as a career, a lifestyle, because in fact they, too, would be able in the long run to support their families.

I am disturbed, however, that education has not received the bipartisan attention that it deserves. We are finding out that even in the proposed 1997 budget, we have a cut by our Republican Congress of some 25 percent for education and training programs. Just this past week, I joined my school superintendent from one of the school districts that I represent, the Houston Independent School District, just this past Monday at a school in our district. We were there to speak about the need for school lunches and school breakfasts.

It was interesting to talk to second- and third-graders who were eating heartily. I asked the question as to whether or not a good meal helps them learn, and the broad smile and the brightness of their eyes indicated such; that with these supplemental lunch and breakfast programs, for which many children that is the only meal they get, it provided for a better opportunity and atmosphere for them to learn.

□ 2045

They even said, and they joined me in my comments, that we were determining that some of the school

lunches, because of absenteeism, were not utilized, and the youngsters said, "Well, we can give this food to the poor people," which this school district will now be considering. So we do not waste taxpayers' dollars, and we provide opportunities for those foods that are given for school lunch that may not be used, as I said, because of absenteeism, and they are to be used that day and cannot be held over for another day, to work with the private sector to make sure those foods get to hungry families.

So education partnerships can be constructive. But at the same time those children were coming up with those very creative ideas, they could not tell me how to stop the leaking roofs, the paint that was peeling, the lead-based paints, the overcrowding that was occurring. They clearly needed the participation not only of the local community—of which we will have a bond election in our community on May 28, that is the local community's participation in Houston—but it is what you have said over the years, Congressman FIELDS, about how we have abandoned the physical plants of our schools throughout the Nation.

We can account for the fact that our children are unable to perform because they have a poor physical plant, poor access to recreational facilities, small classrooms, unattractive classrooms, as I said, faulty equipment. All of this bears upon how we focus on our children.

We see, as the children grow, that we have determined that over 2.5 million students in this new budget, 1,000 post-secondary educational institutions, will be suffering with the elimination of the Direct Student Loan Program.

Goals 2000, which many gathered together in harmony to support, including President Bush, through this new budget Republicans would deny 5 million students in 8,500 schools the funding that they currently receive to raise their academic achievement. We are determined, according to this budget by Republicans, to deny campus-based low-interest loans to 150,000 post-secondary students.

We were concerned in our community about the attack on bilingual education. I had a youngster come to me and say that even she noted the need for improvement in bilingual education, so that we can provide an equal playing field for those youngsters and families who have come to this Nation to seek a better opportunity.

Why should we abandon them, throw them to the wolves, if you will, for other fears and apprehensions that we may have? Why not at least give the children the best education we can give them? The bilingual education allows them to be proficient in English and certainly to be bilingual, which we have determined is equally important.

Needless to say, our libraries in our school—I was also in the library of the school I attended, and by the way, it was Atherton Elementary in the fifth ward, the school that both

Congressperson Mickey Leland and Congressperson Barbara Jordan attended in Houston. Clearly in its instruction it has the potential to raise up great leaders of this Nation.

But if we continue to undermine the educational system with more cuts and more cuts and more cuts, and more leaking roofs and smaller recreational fields and no funding for athletics, we are going to begin to say to those youngsters not "Yes, I can," but "No, you cannot." I would simply say that it is high time for us to really put our money where our minds say they are, and to ensure that there is an opportunity for youngsters to learn.

I might, if I could, Mr. FIELDS, ask of you, because I know that you have worked not only inside the classroom in terms of your support for the tools that are needed to educate our children, but you in fact have developed sort of a congressional classroom that has helped to educate our children about Government. I imagine that that is a partnership that you have endeavored to participate in, and not calling on Federal funds, but you have helped to expand the horizons of young children.

I have in my district over 125,000 households that have incomes of less than \$25,000. With that in mind, my question to you—because I looked at the demographics of my district, and certainly we are very gratified to have some 1,608 households making over \$150,000. I am always encouraged when we can find folk having the ability to improve their condition.

But I have at least 120,000, I said 125,000, let me be more accurate and say I have about 121,000 households with families making under \$25,000. And let me say to you that I have households of families making under \$5,000, 26,000 households in the 18th District of Texas.

What I would say to you is with those kinds of numbers, you would find it and I would find it extremely difficult for those families to participate in the private school system, which is a very good system. I am trying to grapple with whether we have had any direction, as you can see it, where this Congress clearly goes on record to support the public school system with the kind of funding and partnership programs that would ensure that those in households like those that I represent can continue to be assured that their children will have the best education.

I am not sure in your research whether you have discovered whether we are on the right track to protect the least of those who are trying to do the best by their children.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I can only say to the gentlewoman that as Members of Congress, as you know, we should view education across the board, irrespective of what kind of household an individual actually comes from, what income level they come from.

The national security risk that we have in this country is to not educate

our children. That is the biggest threat that this country is faced with, not Russia, but to actually have thousands upon thousands of kids who are not literate, that is a national security threat in my mind. Because who will take on the jobs of tomorrow if we do not educate our children? Who will serve in the military, in fact, if we do not educate our children?

I think this Congress is going to get there. Tonight I am working for bipartisanship. I want to pull Members from both sides of the aisle to just sit down and talk about education before we walk to the floor of the Congress, and work out our differences to the extent that we can, because there is not a Member of this Congress who does not believe that a child should not get a quality education.

Now many say, well, education should be a local issue. We should send money to locals, and the locals should basically make those decisions in terms of how they run their educational systems. I differ with that. That is not to say that I am absolutely right.

I just feel that education should be a partnership. I think it should be a partnership between local, State, and Federal Government. I just think the three of us ought to have a role in education. If we have a role, if the city, if the local, the State, and the Federal Government can play a role in putting people in jail and building prisons, then we ought to have a role in building schools and educating our children.

I just feel very strongly about that, and I think there are enough Members of this Congress, because when each of us runs for office, let us face it, there is not a Member of this House who does not run for Congress and use education as an issue, not one. You can poll any district in America, and you will find that education is an issue, among other issues, but never will people say education is not an issue. Every citizen in this country is concerned about education.

Now, the gentlewoman mentioned the congressional classroom and you also mentioned, as I stated earlier, that money is not everything. The solution to education is not necessarily money. I do not think this caucus, I do not want to scare people away from this caucus, to think that this is a caucus only to do budget pushing for education. This is a caucus to really improve the quality of education for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for starting the same kind of program. We started congressional classroom in Louisiana. I noticed at town hall meetings, I saw parents, I did not see kids. Every town hall meeting I had when I was first elected to Congress, the adults were there. Mom or grandmother, they were there, dad, granddad, they were there, but very seldom would you see son or daughter.

So I decided I wanted to get young people involved, and we started a congressional classroom. I tell you, since the development of that group, it grew from 250 to now over 3,000 kids, and their interest level is so high because they feel that somebody really cares about education.

We challenge them. We tell them, "Listen, you come to class. We have classes on weekends. In order to come to class, you have to behave yourself. You have to respect people. You have to do well in school." We take time with them.

We have had people like Vice President AL GORE to walk into a classroom, to their classroom, the Vice President of the United States of America, and say "Listen, you better not do drugs, and you better stay in school." These kids, I mean chills running down their spine to say the Vice President of the United States of America cared enough about me to come to this little classroom and say, "Stay away from drugs, and I care about you."

Even today, in classroom settings, in classroom meetings, members of the classroom: "How is the Vice President? You tell him I am doing well." Janet Reno, the Attorney General, met with these kids. Tomorrow, General Colin Powell, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, flying to Baton Rouge, LA to meet with 3,000 kids and challenge them that they can be any and everything that they want to be if they believe in themselves.

Mr. Speaker, that is not government. General Powell is retired. That is personal involvement. We were preparing for this program this weekend. For 2 months, these kids, they were practicing their speeches, they are so excited about meeting General Powell.

That is going to have an everlasting impact. That is not a piece of legislation, but it is going to have an everlasting impact on those kids when they hear somebody who they have had an opportunity to see on TV, but now in person tell them, "Listen, education is important. Let me tell you my story. I did not become Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by dropping out, by doing drugs, by not working hard." It makes these kids say, "Well, golly, I can do that."

So everything is not government, and if each Member of this Congress, like the gentlewoman starting the same kind of program, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JACKSON] is starting the same kind of program, the gentleman from your State, Mr. GREEN, is starting this same kind of program. People from all over the Congress are starting those kinds of programs, and we are committing to spend at least a day a month in a classroom in our respective districts.

We need to bring parents and teachers together. I now have town hall meetings with parents and teachers where parents can meet teachers and teachers can meet parents, town hall meetings on education.

When they walk into that room, they do not just talk about, well, we need

better funding. They talk about how we can improve the quality of education. "How can I get involved, Congressman, as a parent? I want to be more involved in the education of my child and the future of my child. I want to work with my child's teacher." It is amazing things that happen in town hall meetings. This caucus will bring those things to the forefront.

So I want to urge Members on both sides of the aisle, let us talk about it. We talk about peanuts. We talk about cotton. We caucus for gas and oil. We caucus for almost every issue in this country. Let us caucus for education.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The gentleman has captured, has given me a response that hopefully will be heeded to by the bipartisan nature of this Congress and certainly for years past. I think it is extremely important that we raise education to the level that every child has an opportunity to access this door opener, this key to opportunity.

I applaud the concept of having a caucus that talks about policy issues that are not necessarily budget-driven and can, for example, emphasize the fact that public schools have a very viable role because they educate those children who would least have an opportunity.

□ 2100

Also I would mention to you that you are right when it comes to working on issues that help education. We find many aspects of our legislation that are not education-directed having educational impact. The telecommunications bill that was passed I am gratified to say to you as a member of that conference committee, there was an insistence that this new superhighway have direct direction into our schools and our libraries. The Education Caucus can certainly be part of directing or discussing how best to insure that all of our schools have access to the superhighway and all of our libraries and all of our youngsters have that kind of access.

Also questions about how we do public-private partnerships, such as the program that you have, where the focus is to tell a child that they, too, can succeed and to engage them in the political process, can be a byproduct of the education caucus.

The overall byproduct, in addition to these questions of policy, I hope will be even a bipartisan effort as to what a budget really should look like, that says that we together believe education is important, as you have said, and I certainly have seen, among many of our colleagues. It would allow that kind of discussion before the heat of the discussion of an appropriations period and authorization period or the final act of the budget.

So I am looking forward to the further progress that will engender ideas

from Members of Congress, will encourage further debate on how to utilize the educational system to help all of our citizens.

I think job retraining is a part of this whole education question. I think the training of those who we are encouraging to go from welfare to work is part of this education. Education is, again, the door opener, the even playing field.

If I might throw in an aspect of education, we will need to discuss in a bipartisan manner with our colleagues just how we deal with the access to institutions of higher learning, where we do not have attacks on the opportunities for institutions of higher learning to seek to diversify their student body under the guise of an affirmative action program that seeks to bring in students from all walks of life, which we should applaud, because that is giving or providing education for all of our children. Even with that very, if you will, spirited aspect of this Congress, this question of affirmative action, even that I think can be discussed in a bipartisan manner as relates to education and insuring that the doors of opportunity are open to our youngsters all over this country.

So I applaud the gentleman from Louisiana again. I cited statistics from my districts. There is no doubt that the 18th Congressional District desires to be in the forefront of educational reform, educational bipartisanship, with the direction of uplifting our children. I would hope as we do that, we would find the appropriate funding line that would make sure that we do speak with strength, to ensure we are able to provide that opportunity for our children.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Again I want to thank the gentlewoman for joining me tonight in this special order. I will simply close by saying we have had a lot of finger pointing on issues, issue like education. I think it is high time for us to stop pointing fingers and start working together to try to bring a solution to a real problem, because there is a problem. There is a problem in a country when you find yourself spending more money on jails than you do schools. There is a problem when you have kids who walk into classrooms and walk down the street or drive down the highway and find their schoolhouse is in worse condition than the jailhouse. There is a problem when the jail is in better condition than the school. There is a problem in the country when the air conditioner at the school does not work, but the air conditioner at the jail works. There is a problem when the jail ceilings never leak, and the school ceiling leaks every time it rains. There is a serious problem in America, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and there always be a problem, as long as we look at education as only a local issue, and not sit around the table and talk about how we can improve it.

Let me close finally by just giving you some of the benefits of education.

If you really want to do something about welfare in this country and getting people off the welfare roll, then we really ought to do a better job at educating people. If you want to decrease crime in this country, and you really want to decrease crime, then we have got to do something about educating people. If you want to get people to work and get them off the unemployment rolls, then you have to do something to educate people.

Everybody wins when we educate our kids. We lose when we do not. Over 80 percent of the people, Mr. Speaker, who are in jail are high school dropouts. There is a nexus and relationship between education and incarceration. We spend almost \$30,000, \$25,000 to \$30,000, to incarcerate a child, and only about \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year to educate them. Welfare rolls, most of the people on welfare are high school dropouts. So if we really want to improve the conditions of our country, then we must invest in education.

I want to thank the Speaker for being so patient tonight. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Oregon, Ms. FURSE, who has worked so hard on the issue of education and who is one of the whips of this caucus. I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California Ms. PELOSI, who has been working hard on the issue of education. Finally I want to thank the cochair of this caucus, Senator WELLSTONE, who has been a very strong champion of education for our children in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following materials for the RECORD.

EDUCATION CAUCUS MEMBERSHIP

Rep. Mike Bilirakis, Rep. David Bonior, Sen. John Breaux, Rep. George Brown, Rep. James Clyburn, Rep. Robert Cramer, Rep. Peter DeFazio, Sen. Christopher Dodd, Rep. Anna Eshoo, Rep. Eni Faleomavaega, Rep. Chaka Fattah,* Rep. Vic Fazio, Rep. Cleo Fields,** Rep. Victor Frazier, Rep. Martin Frost, Rep. Elizabeth Furse, Rep. Sam Gejdenson, Rep. Sam Gibbons, Rep. Gene Green,* Rep. Maurice Hinchey, Sen. Bennett Johnston, Rep. Bernice Johnson, Rep. Tim Johnson, Rep. Joe Kennedy, Rep. Patrick Kennedy, Rep. Bill Luther, Rep. Carrie Meek, Sen. Moseley-Braun, Rep. L.F. Payne, Rep. Nancy Pelosi, Rep. Lynn Rivers, Rep. Bernard Sanders, Rep. Tom Sawyer,* Rep. José Serrano, Rep. Louise Slaughter, Rep. John Spratt, Rep. Bennie Thompson, Rep. Bob Torricelli, Rep. Edolphus Towns, Rep. Robert Underwood, Rep. Nydia Velázquez, Rep. Maxine Waters, Rep. Curt Weldon, Sen. Paul Wellstone,** and Rep. Albert Wynn.

*Indicates membership on the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee.

**Indicates Co-Chair of Education Caucus.

TESTIMONY OF STARLA JEWELL-KELLY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNITY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION BEFORE THE EDUCATION CAUCUS, MAY 16, 1996, PANEL DISCUSSION

Senator Wellstone, Representative Fields and Members of the Education Caucus: Thank you for this opportunity to present testimony regarding the state of education in our country. I am delighted that the caucus was formed and has such a diverse membership.

I am Starla Jewell-Kelly, Executive Director of the National Community Education Association. The invitation from Rep. Fields asked that I provide the Caucus with some of my thoughts on the systemic deficiencies contributing to the education crisis in this country. The task we face today is formidable. The world has changed, and children have changed. If you have any doubt of that, walk through most any high school in this country, and you will definitely feel like you have entered another world.

If we are serious about systemic change in education, then I believe what we follow the old adage. The main thing to remember is to remember the main thing—children—not the teachers, not the unions, not the administrators, the business community, or the politicians, but, the children. We let children know that they are valued. We do not practice a double standard wherein some children get the very best and others are left to make-do with the left-overs.

Education has always been rooted deeply in the spirit and in the community of this nation. Every morning, 40 million children get out of bed and hurry off to 83,000 schools from Bangor, Maine to Hawaii. An absolutely stunning achievement, according to the Ernest Boyer, which we all too often take for granted. This was not accomplished by a Washington directive, but by local citizens who have committed themselves to the audacious dream of the common school for the common good.

The truth is, dreams can be fulfilled only when they have been defined, and if during the decade of the 90's quality education would become a mandate of the nation, then I am convinced that all of the other goals of our country would in large measure be fulfilled.

We start by making sure that our children are fed, healthy, cared-for, guided and loved. We make sure that they do not have to walk through flying bullets, step over dead bodies, broken glass, drug paraphernalia and boarded up and decaying buildings to get to school. We let them know that they do count by putting them in school buildings that are warm and safe, not deteriorating, not rat-infested. We give them books that are current and high-tech equipment that is in good repair.

We let them know that they are expected to achieve high levels. We do not "dumb down" the curriculum. We expect our teachers to be dedicated and supportive of all students. We let the teachers know that their task is one of the most important in this world. We support teachers in their efforts to help every child reach his or her potential. We also expect accountability from all school personnel as well as from parents. We do this at the local level, building by building. We stop experimenting with school reform models that work in one place and not another. We expect each community to design its own reform efforts and to do so with input from families, teachers, students and other community members. We expect entire communities to be responsible for their children, not just the schools. And, we do not "write-off" the kids who are in trouble or considered at-risk.

We start as this committee has started—by sitting down around a table and asking, "What can we do to help our children?" We let go of turf issues, our own agendas, and look for a way to bring together all of our resources in order to provide for our children the start in life and education that they and this country so desperately need. Secretary of Education Riley has made the first steps toward this effort with his Family Involvement Initiative. He has convened school, business, religious and community representatives in order to find ways in which

we can all work together to support and nurture our children.

We are inclusive, not exclusive. We view the school as a delivery site for all educational, social, and health services. These services are delivered by the social and health professionals. We do not expect classroom teachers to do those tasks for which they are not trained. We keep the school building open after school for child care so the 30-50% of our children who now go home to empty houses do not need to. And we open the school early in the morning for before school child care. We protect our children from neighborhoods that would destroy the scant amount of hope they may have.

We provide lifelong learning for the families of our children so they are prepared to work in today's working environment and be flexible enough in their training that they can adapt to the changes occurring so rapidly. By guaranteeing the quality of our work force, we also guarantee a level of economic security for our families. I don't believe that as a nation we can afford to do any less. Every institution and community has an ethical and educational obligation to commit itself to create a safety net for children. Schools cannot do the job alone.

If we expect all children to be well prepared for school, we simply must have families and communities that first give love then support to their children. We must prepare our parents for parenting. We must teach them how to nurture their young and how to raise healthy, contributing members of a community.

Does this sound impossible? It is not. We have schools and communities such as these all across our 50 states. They are called community schools and they have been functioning for the past 50 years. In New York they are also called Beacon Schools. They are learning communities that spread their influence community-wide. Do they work? Yes. Do they cure all the problems. No. But, through local decision-making and collaboration, they go a long way towards addressing community needs. They make a difference in the quality of life of their local communities and in their schools.

We can do this if only we remember the main thing—and that is to remember the main thing—Children and their future, for it is really our future as well. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today, and would be pleased to respond to any questions the caucus may have.

REMARKS OF JOEL PACKER, SENIOR LOBBYIST, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, MAY 16, 1996

Thank you for the opportunity to address the historic first session of the Congressional Education Caucus, which we hope will help to restore the tradition of bipartisan leadership on Capitol Hill for children and education. Coordination and cooperation across party lines are essential to strengthening public education in America and providing every child with an excellent opportunity to learn. Those goals are central to the mission of the National Education Association, and I know they are shared by everybody in this room. I want to offer a few thoughts on how this caucus can work effectively to strengthen education, and briefly outline NEA's education agenda.

First, let me tell you about the NEA. We represent over 2.2 million educators, including both elementary and secondary public school teachers, higher education faculty, and education support personnel ranging from school bus drivers to cafeteria workers to custodians. In addition, we have both student members and retired members. NEA conducts research on school finance, sponsors the National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, which is dedicated

to improving student performance, works to improve teaching and learning through many projects including Learning Laboratories, Mastery in Learning program, Teacher Education Initiative, and Keys to Excellence for Your Schools; maintains a Professional Library for educators, and actively promotes quality public schools at both the Federal and state level through our 13,000 local affiliates.

It is important to put today's challenges in historical perspective. Over the past few decades, most of the landmark education legislation was passed by strong bipartisan majorities. Many of these bills were championed by Republican leaders in the House and Senate, and many were signed into law by Republican presidents.

To cite a few examples, over twenty years ago, in the summer of 1975, the Congress passed legislation guaranteeing a free appropriate public education to children with disabilities. The bill passed the Senate 63-10, while the House margin was 375-44. Even this year, in the Senate the IDEA reauthorization is a true bipartisan effort, with legislation sponsored by Sen. Harkin (D-IA) reported unanimously by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee.

The Elementary/Secondary Education Act was reauthorized in 1987 by a vote of 401-1. This bill included Title I, as well as bilingual education. The Senate vote that year was 97-1. Vocational Education, was reauthorized in 1989, with the House bill passing 402-3, and the Senate acting by a unanimous 96-0. The following year, Head Start was extended by a 404-14 House vote. Higher education programs have also enjoyed this broad bipartisan consensus. The Higher Education Act was reauthorized in 1992, by a 419-7 vote in the House and a 93-1 vote in the Senate.

And just a few weeks ago, many Republicans joined Democrats in restoring over \$3 billion in education funds that had earlier been cut from the FY 1996 appropriations legislation. So there is ample precedent for the bipartisan work of this Caucus.

As all of the public opinion polls have shown this year, the American people have put education at or near the top of their priority list of issues. Indeed, voters also recognize the importance of the Federal role in education, with upwards of 90% of Americans opposing cutting Federal aid to education. And their focus on education crosses party lines. In a USA Today poll this January, for example, education led voter concerns and vied closely with deficit reduction as a concern among Republican voters. Senator D'Amato was right on target when he recently commented that American voters "did not vote to cut education."

I want to make it clear to this group that NEA's goal for the coming years is to build a bipartisan pro-education majority and to work with leaders from both parties who want to strengthen public education. We are very grateful for the hard work of Democratic leaders on our agenda this year, but we also thank mainstream Republicans who courageously stood up for education and we hope and expect that more will join your ranks in the coming years.

A bipartisan education caucus could play an important role through a variety of activities ranging from sponsoring briefings for Members and staff, preparing objective reports on education issues, providing analysis of proposed education legislation, and serving to advocate the needs of children and education through testimony, floor speeches, introduction of legislation, and sponsoring of floor amendments.

Let me briefly outline our legislative agenda for the balance of 1996.

Ensuring adequate funding for children and education. While the deep cuts advocated by

many in the House leadership were largely rejected in the final FY 96 appropriations bill, education programs were still cut by \$450 million. This is on top of over \$600 million in cuts that passed as part of the FY 95 recession bill. Thus, since the beginning of 1995, over \$1 billion has been slashed from education. Both the FY 97 House and Senate budget resolutions fail to invest in children and education, since they provide no growth to compensate for inflation, 20% enrollment increases at the K-12 level, or rising college costs. Indeed, the House budget would slice over \$1 billion from the FY 96 levels, and again attempt to eliminate Goals 2000 education reform, bilingual and immigrant education, Perkins Student Loans, State Student Incentive Grants, and many other important programs. Indeed, even a freeze over six years results in cuts of at least 17% from FY 96 levels.

Extending and Strengthening the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. NEA strongly supports reauthorization of IDEA, with provisions to increase local flexibility for schools to properly discipline seriously disruptive students, strengthen professional development, and provide adequate resources to ensure that appropriate services are provided to children with disabilities.

Opposing back door block grants under the Local Flexibility and Empowerment Act. While NEA supports increased flexibility for local schools to administer Federal education programs, we believe that legislation now pending in Congress (HR 2086/S 88) would undermine Federal education programs, allowing for education dollars to be siphoned off for other purposes, and weaken or remove accountability and important standards for program quality and access for disadvantaged children.

Stopping efforts to punish immigrant children. NEA strongly opposes the so-called Gallegly amendment, which passed the House as a part of the immigration bill (H.R. 2202), that would allow states to deny public education to illegal immigrant children. Not only would this proposal unfairly punish children for actions of their parents, it would create significant paperwork and administrative burdens on both local schools and parents of all children, who would have to document and prove the immigration or citizenship status of their children.

Preventing expansion of Federal courts control over local schools. Under legislation advocated by the Christian Coalition, known as the Parental Rights and Responsibilities Act (H.R. 1946/S 984) parents would be granted unlimited right to sue schools in federal court over virtually any decision of their local school. Discipline policies, selection of textbooks, curricula content, and other local decisions would all be subject to litigation by parents, with Federal courts deciding local educational policies. Not only would this bill gut the authority of locally elected school boards, it would also lead to teachers' efforts to report possible cases of child abuse and neglect being deemed an interference with parental rights.

In addition to these issues, NEA is fighting to ensure that secondary and postsecondary students continue to receive needed vocational education services, to oppose the imposition of private school vouchers, to protect the school lunch program from block grants, and to protect needed health care services for children through Medicaid.

Looking beyond 1996, we are planning to work with the new Congress that takes office in 1997 on new initiatives for education. Like many of our coalition partners, we have several pro-active strategies we are now discussing and developing to address such pressing issues as school infrastructure and technology needs. Our vision for all children is a

vision of safe schools, active learning, advanced technology, and modern classrooms. Our vision includes keeping the things that are working well in schools and scrapping those that are not. Our vision includes a public education system where every person in the community has a voice and a role, in ensuring that tomorrow's schools serve tomorrow's students.

We plan to bring this group into that collaboration. The next four years will bring us to the year 2000—a major benchmark for American education. We look forward to working with you to make this a very productive and forward-looking time for education in the United States Congress.

TESTIMONY OF ANGELICA SANTACRUZ, NATIONAL HEADSTART ASSOCIATION, EDUCATION CAUCUS, HEARING ON MAY 16, 1996

Congressman Cleo Fields, and members of the Education Caucus. I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify today about the Head Start program and the National Head Start's Association's (NHSA) vision for including all eligible children in Head Start.

I would like to applaud Congressman Fields for forming a bipartisan Congressional Education Caucus to address the issues confronting the current education system. It is time to meet the challenge together and include early childhood programs in the process. In terms of providing children in poverty with a fair chance to start equally in school, Head Start has proven it works over 30 years. However, there are issues that must be addressed: increasing funding to service all eligible children who need Head Start; providing services that meet the needs of today's families; and providing leadership to build a more coordinated and effective system of services for children and families through collaboration and research.

HEAD START

Since 1965, Head Start has provided comprehensive services including health, education, social services and parent involvement to more than 14 million children and their families. Today, Head Start serves over 750,000 children in approximately 1,433 grant-ees, reaching low-income children in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Pacific territories.

Head Start serves children ages zero to five, with four-year-olds comprising 62 percent of its population. More than 13% of Head Start enrollment consists of children with disabilities.

The basic goal of Head Start is to bring about a greater degree of social competence in children of low income families. The Head Start program is a developmental approach to helping children achieve social competence. To the accomplishment of this goal, Head Start objectives and performance standards provide for: The improvement of the child's health and physical abilities; the encouragement of self-confidence and self-discipline; the enhancement of the child's mental processes and skills with particular attention to conceptual and communication skills; the establishment of patterns and expectations of success for the child; an increase in the ability of the child and family to relate to each other and to others; and the enhancement of the sense of dignity and self-worth within the child and his family.

Head Start works! Research shows that Head Start has had an important impact on program participants. Positive impacts include: Improving cognitive test scores, including reading; reducing placement in special education; increasing self-confidence and improving social behavior; improving health, including better eating habits, decreasing anemia and increasing immunizations received; improving parent awareness;

and enhancing parent's employment and educational status.

ISSUES

Head Start's record of achievements and experience in providing comprehensive services to low-income children and their families, makes it the perfect program to address these new challenges and to help build a competitive and strong country. Head Start has the potential to serve as a model of comprehensive services, to reach large numbers of children and families, to respond to a diversity of needs, and to provide leadership in collaboration and research for the entire early childhood field. Yet today, funding for Head Start falls short and limits the program's ability to meet its full potential.

Three conditions exist in Head Start that must be addressed. First, to be effective in the future, the program must continue to provide good early childhood services. However, Head Start faces threats to program quality.

Second, in the upcoming years, Head Start must be expanded to serve all eligible children and must be flexible enough to meet the diverse needs of children and families, particularly demands for full-day centers. Presently, Head Start serves 20 percent of zero to five-year-olds. The demand for Head Start is still tremendous.

Third, as the largest early childhood program, Head Start must provide leadership to the entire early childhood field. It must help develop a coordinated delivery system, ensure adequate community services for low-income families, encourage the continuation of comprehensive services as children move on to the public schools and develop new knowledge to improve practice and policy. There is increasing concern that the progress made by children in the Head Start program may be lost when there is not continuation of comprehensive services in the school. At the federal and local levels, there has been a lack of collaboration between Head Start and federal programs serving low-income families.

The Administration of Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) has put considerable effort into improving the transition of children as they move to kindergarten through the Transition Project. Although these efforts have been useful to the initial adjustment of children as they enter school, there is a need for schools to become much more involved with families.

Despite the challenges, Head Start has accomplished major early childhood services. The following are some of Head Start's ultimate highlights: The Child Development Associate (CDA) programs; Home-based services; Bilingual-multicultural approaches; Indian and Migrant Head Start Programs; Resource Access Projects provide training and technical assistance to programs; Early Start provides services to zero-to-three year-olds; Performance Standards; and Quality Improvement.

Congress and the Clinton Administration must remember that Head Start is an investment. President Clinton has proposed for Head Start for fiscal year 1997 \$3.981 billion. The National Head Start Association urges Congress to consider an appropriations bill that moves toward the goals of both the Bush and Clinton Administrations to expand Head Start to guarantee services to all eligible children by the year 2000.

TESTIMONY OF JERRY LEWIS, J.D., BEFORE
THE CONGRESSIONAL EDUCATION CAUCUS,
MAY 16, 1996

Senator Wellstone, Congressman Fields, Members of the Education Caucus, I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today. My name is Jerry Lewis and I am the Director of Intensive Edu-

cational Development at the University of Maryland-College Park. In that capacity I am responsible for two of the Federal TRIO Programs sponsored by the University. These include the Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program and the Student Support Services Program. I am testifying today on behalf of the National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations (NCEOA).

Before sharing my brief remarks on post-secondary educational opportunity as it relates to low-income students in America, I want to take a moment to applaud your efforts in establishing this Caucus. The federal role in assuring educational opportunity has become increasingly questioned in recent years. Moreover, even those who articulate support for education often do not back their words with dollars. Your active advocacy for education is deeply appreciated.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY IS DECLINING

There is presently extensive evidence on the growing gaps in educational attainment between children from upper-income families and children from low-income families. As reported in *Business Week*, utilizing Census data, Thomas Mortenson demonstrates that a child from a family in the bottom income quarter (family income below \$22,000) has only an 8% chance of graduating from college with a Baccalaureate by the time he is 24. In contrast, a child from a family in the top income quarter (income above \$68,000 per year) has a 79% chance of attaining the Baccalaureate at this juncture. Thus individuals from upper-income families are more than ten times as likely to graduate from college by the time they are 24 than are individuals from low-income families.

At the same time, the ability of any worker to adequately support his or her family without a college education is declining. Today, median family income in households headed by an individual with a college degree is \$73,000 per year, an increase in real dollar terms of 14% since 1973. At the same time, households headed by individuals with only a high school diploma have a median income of \$41,000, a decrease of 20% in the same time period. Households headed by families without a high school diploma have a median income of only \$28,000. Real median income for households headed by the least educated individuals has fallen over 37% since 1973.

ADDRESSING THIS CRITICAL ISSUE

The Federal government has historically utilized a multi-pronged strategy to support post-secondary educational opportunity. Student financial assistance—grants, loans and work—are made available to low and middle-income students so that lack of financial resources does not prevent them from enrolling and succeeding in college. Unfortunately, as the following chart demonstrates, student aid has not kept pace with inflation. While in the Mid-1970's the principal Federal grant program—Pell—covered nearly 80% of the cost of attending a public, four-year college, today it covers less than 40% of that cost.

While student financial aid helps students overcome financial barriers to higher education, TRIO programs help students overcome class, social and cultural barriers to college. Over 1,200 colleges, universities and agencies now sponsor TRIO programs which enroll nearly 700,000 low-income students who aspire to attend or are currently enrolled in college.

As mandated by Congress, two-thirds of the students served in TRIO must come from families with incomes under \$24,000, where neither parent graduated from college. Over 1,750 TRIO Programs currently serve nearly 700,000 low-income Americans between the

ages of 11 and 27. Many programs serve students in grade six through twelve. Forty-two percent (42%) of TRIO students are White, 35% are African American, 15% are Hispanic, 4% are Native American, and 4% are Asian. Sixteen thousand (16,000) TRIO students are disabled and 7,000 are military veterans.

TRIO is made up of five programs. Three assist young people and adults in learning about and preparing for college: Talent Search, Upward Bound, Educational Opportunity Centers. Congressman Fields is himself a product of one of the programs—Upward Bound at Southern University—and he has often voiced strong support for TRIO.

In addition to their pre-college efforts, there are two programs—Student Support Services and Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program—which serve undergraduates. At the University of Maryland, for example, each year Student Support Services provides counseling, tutoring, and other support to over 350 students. These services are made possible by over \$350,000 in institutional funds and \$245,000 in TRIO funds. And this investment has made a difference. For example, it has raised the graduation rates of those minority students enrolled in Student Support Services by over 70% over graduation rates of minority students not assisted by Student Support Services.

EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT

I could speak much more than my allotted time, providing evidence on TRIO's behalf. It is noteworthy, for example, that:

Students in the Upward Bound program are four times more likely to earn an undergraduate degree than students from similar backgrounds who did not participate in TRIO.

Nearly 20% of all Black and Hispanic freshman who entered college in 1981 received assistance through the TRIO Talent Search or EOC programs.

Students in the TRIO Student Support Services program are more than twice as likely to remain in college than those students from similar backgrounds who did not participate in the program.

TRIO Programs are very effective and many students from low-income families depend on these programs to succeed academically in high school and college. In fact, since 1965 an estimated two million students have graduated from college with the special assistance and support of our nation's TRIO Programs.

I am more comfortable, however, citing individuals than statistics. One has only to look at Congressman Fields—and his three colleagues in the House who were also TRIO participants—to learn of TRIO's merits. (Congressman Bonilla, Congressman Watts, and Congressman Wynn were also TRIO graduates.) One can turn to the nineteen freshmen in Student Support Services' freshman class at the University of Maryland who have grade point averages above 3.0 as a measure of TRIO's achievement. One can look at our recent graduates who came from D.C. Public Schools and single parent homes and are now enrolled in doctoral programs in mathematics and computer science to learn of TRIO's achievement. I am confident each of you has also visited with TRIO students and TRIO graduates and knows of TRIO's accomplishments.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify today and would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

REPUBLICANS' SNEAK ATTACK ON AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May