

quality, that they choose schools based on other factors, but that's not what the parents say."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 18, 1997]

CLEVELAND SHATTERS MYTHS ABOUT SCHOOL CHOICE

(By Jay P. Greene, William G. Howell and Paul E. Peterson)

As delays in repairs keep the doors to Washington D.C.'s public schools closed, Congress is debating whether to approve the District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act, which could help restructure this dreary, patronage-ridden system and give at least a couple of thousand poor students a chance to attend the private school of their choice. True to his teacher-union allies, President Clinton remains adamantly opposed to giving poor children the same chance at a private education that his daughter, Chelsea, had.

In deciding whether to challenge the president, Congress would do well to consider what's been happening in Cleveland, site of the first-state-funded program to give low-income students a choice of both religious and secular schools. Of more than 6,200 applicants, pupils entering grades K-3 last year, nearly 2,000 received scholarships to attend one of 55 schools. The scholarships cover up to 90% of a school's tuition, to a maximum of \$2,250, little more than a third the per-pupil cost of Cleveland public schools.

This past summer we surveyed more than 2,000 parents, both scholarship recipients and those who applied but did not participate in the program. We found that parents to scholarship recipients new to choice schools were much more satisfied with every aspect of their school than parents of children still in public school. Sixty-three percent of choice parents report being "very satisfied" with the "academic quality" of their school, as compared with less than 30% of public school parents. Nearly 60% were "very satisfied" with school safety, as compared with just over a quarter of those in public school. With respect to school discipline, 55% of new choice parents, but only 23% of public-school parents, were very satisfied.

The differences in satisfaction rates were equally large when parents were asked about the school's individual attention to their child, parental involvement, class size and school facilities. The most extreme differences in satisfaction pertained to teaching moral values: 71% of choice parents were "very satisfied," but only 25% of those in public schools were.

Our other findings provide powerful answers to many of the arguments raised by voucher opponents:

Parents, especially poor parents, are not competent to evaluate their child's educational experience. But test scores from two of the newly established choice schools justify parental enthusiasm. Choice students attending these schools, approximately 25% of the total coming from public schools, gained, on average, five percentile points in reading and 15 points in mathematics during the course of the school year.

Choice schools don't retain their students. In fact, even though low-income, inner-city families are a highly mobile population, only 7% of all scholarship recipients reported that they did not attend the same school for the entire year. Among recipients new to choice schools the percentage was 10%. The comparable percentages for central-city public schools is twice as large.

Private schools expel students who cannot keep up. But only 0.4% of the parents of scholarship students new to school choice re-

port this as a reason they changed schools this fall.

Poor families pick their children's schools on the basis of sports, friends, religion or location, not academic quality. Yet 85% of scholarship recipients from public schools listed "academic quality" as a "very important reason" for their application to the program. Second in importance was the "greater safety" to be found at a choice school, a reason given by 79% of the recipients. "Location" was ranked third. "Religion" was ranked fourth, said to be very important by 37%. Friends were said to be very important by less than 20%.

Private schools engage in "creaming," admitting only the best, easiest-to-educate students. But most applicants found schools willing to accept them, even though a lawsuit filed by the American Federation of Teachers prevented the program from operating until two weeks before school started. When those who were offered but did not accept a scholarship were asked why, inability to secure admission to their desired private school was only the fourth most frequently given reason, mentioned by just 21% of the parents remaining in public schools. Transportation problems, financial considerations and admission to a desired public school were all mentioned more frequently. (Cleveland has magnet schools that may have opened their doors to some scholarship applicants.)

The data from Cleveland have some limitations, because the program was not set up as a randomized experiment. Yet the comparisons between scholarship recipients new to choice schools and those remaining in public schools are meaningful. That's because, with respect to most of their demographic characteristics—such as mother's education, mother's employment, and family size—the families of scholarship recipients did not differ from those remaining in public schools. In fact, the voucher recipients actually had lower incomes than the group to which they were compared.

Cleveland's success at school choice should not remain an exception to public schools' monopoly on education. If members of Congress care at all about the education of poor children living in the inner-city, they should approve the voucher legislation for Washington now before them.

NATIONAL PARK FEE EQUITY ACT

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1997

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the National Park Fee Equity Act. This legislation will allow those national parks which cannot charge an entrance fee to keep all other fees which are collected for activities within that park.

There are units of the park system which cannot collect fees because when these parks were created deed restricts were placed on the land donated to the Federal Government.

Last Congress, this body recognized the need to keep more of the money in the parks rather than sending it back to Washington. This was accomplished when we created the Fee Demonstration Program.

This program allows parks to keep 80 percent of the user fees, above what was taken in during 1994, in the park where they are collected. Unfortunately, there are some parks which cannot charge entrance fees.

The fact that these parks cannot charge an entrance fee hampers their ability to collect funds for park improvements. Therefore, I think it is only fair that all other fees collected in these parks remain there to help protect and improve them.

One such park, the Great Smoky Mountains, is the most visited park in the United States. However, since it cannot charge an entrance fee, it does not get to keep as much money as other parks do for improvements to campgrounds, trails, buildings, and other facilities there.

I believe that we need to do everything we can to help our Nation's parks. Currently, the National Park System has a maintenance and construction backlog estimated to be between 4 and 6 billion dollars. The bill I have introduced is a step toward addressing this problem.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very modest proposal in terms of the Federal budget. However, this money will go a long way in helping us preserve these parks for enjoyment of future generations. I urge my colleagues to support the National Park Fee Equity Act.

POW-MIA COMMEMORATION DAY

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1997

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, our Nation will commemorate the thousands of American men and women who were lost in action or who experienced the brutality of being a prisoner of war. For every war that America has engaged in since its formation 221 years ago, these men and women fought to protect America's democratic principles and to ensure that future generations could enjoy these freedoms.

Our country joins the American families around the world whose sons and daughters, fathers, mothers, and spouses were lost in action or suffered brutality as a prisoner of war in mourning and bittersweet celebration. We grieve for the soldiers whose lives were lost. Our only consolation is that their families finally find a level of peace by knowing the fate of their loved ones. America can join them in putting closure to the restless years of uncertainty regarding the destiny of these men and women. Together we can find comfort in each other and begin to heal our painful wounds.

Today, Americans around the world also join in rejoicing for those courageous men and women who have returned to us alive and are reunited with their families. We welcome them warmly. Although there are no words that can adequately express our deepest and sincerest gratitude, please know that your sacrifices and those of your families were not in vain. To these soldiers, we thank you. Your years of physical torture, hunger, psychological abuse, and forced labor will never be forgotten. America will never allow it to be forgotten.

America continues to wait apprehensively for the soldiers whose fate is still unknown. We pray together that soon we will learn more on the status of these men and women. Please be assured that America will not rest until all of her sons and daughters are returned to her soil. We anxiously await news of them and hope for their safe return with open hearts and open doors.

Families from my district have not gone unscathed by this tragedy. They suffer the pains of loss, and experience the anguish of uncertainty. William Charles Shinn from Woodland and Jerry M. Shriver from Sacramento are still unaccounted for. The status of the Hill family's father remains a mystery. We join in their families' anxiety of not knowing.

Today, my community also celebrates for the men and women who have returned. Soldiers like Michael O'Conner who was flying a UH-1 helicopter in February 1968, when he was shot down north of Hue. His three other crew members were killed. After evading capture for nearly 2 days, he was captured and held in captivity for 5 years.

Therefore, it is with this mix of sadness, joy, and apprehension, that our Nation's Capitol, the White House, the Department of State, Defense, and Veterans Affairs, the Selective System Headquarters, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial and national cemeteries across the Nation will raise the flag of the National League of Families of American Prisoners of War and Missing in Southeast Asia. May this black and white banner serve as a somber reminder of all those lost; a rejoicing reminder of those returned; and, a flicker of hope for the men and women whom we await their homecoming.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. LUKE CHURCH

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1997

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the 75th anniversary of St. Luke Church in Lakewood, OH. In 1922, Bishop Joseph Schrembs established the parish of St. Luke, the Evangelist.

Lacking suitable facilities in which to hold mass, a large tent was erected on the grounds of a nearby convent where Sunday masses were held. The parishioners continued to have services under the tent for 2½ months. Even though they had numerous weather problems, especially during the bitter cold winter, the determination of Fr. Nolan, the parishioners, and a group of Charity nuns was all that was needed to build the tent back up whenever it fell.

On August 24, 1922, a contract was signed to build a frame church. Fr. Nolan's prayers for a permanent church structure were answered. In 1928, it became not only a place for worship but also a place for education when a school was built around the church.

By 1950, it was apparent that larger facilities were needed to accommodate the growing St. Luke community. A new church was constructed in 13 months with much of the materials coming from Ireland, Germany, France, and Italy. The church was again remodeled in 1984. An addition was constructed on one side of the church enlarging the priests' sacristy. Improvements were made in the school as well, where a library and media center were added.

The Church of St. Luke, the Evangelist has come a long way from its humble beginnings in a tent in a field. St. Luke has grown to be a place for education, worship, and community

involvement over the past 75 years, and I wish the congregation continued success in the future.

HONORING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE DRAFTING OF THE CONSTITUTION

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1997

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call special attention to the Constitution of the United States of America. This treasured document serves as the guardian of our liberties and is a product of reflection and choice—embodying the principles of limited government in a Republic dedicated to rule by law, and not by men.

Abraham Lincoln once called the Constitution, "The only safeguard of our liberties * * *." I strongly concur. Therefore, it is important to recognize that September 17, 1997, marks the 210th anniversary of the drafting of this historic landmark by the 1787 Constitutional Convention.

It is fitting and proper to accord official recognition to this magnificent document and its memorable anniversary—as well as to the patriotic celebrations which will commemorate this grand occasion. Public law guarantees the issuing of a proclamation each year by the President of this great country designating September 17 through 23 as Constitution Week.

In observance of this important national occasion, I ask my fellow citizens to reaffirm the ideals put forth by the Framers of the Constitution over 200 years ago. Only through vigilantly protecting the freedoms guaranteed to us through the Constitution, can we offer future generations the same great inheritance of freedom we currently possess.

THE RESPONSIBLE BORROWER PROTECTION BANKRUPTCY ACT

HON. BILL MCCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 18, 1997

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Responsible Borrower Protection Bankruptcy Act. I am pleased to be joined by my colleague, Mr. BOUCHER. Attached to my statement is a detailed section by section explanation of the legislation.

It has become clear that reform of the existing bankruptcy system is sorely needed as our Nation witnesses an unsustainable epidemic of personal bankruptcies. Bankruptcies have increased over 400 percent since 1980. It is estimated that consumer bankruptcies will rise by over 20 percent in 1997. Last year, for the first time ever, there were more than 1 million filings. This year, that figure is expected to rise to 1.4 million filings, more than one bankruptcy in every 100 American households. This rate of increase is occurring not in the midst of a recession, but during what are by all accounts good economic times. From 1986 to 1996, real per capita annual disposable income grew by over 13 percent but personal bankruptcies more than doubled.

Bankruptcy will cost our Nation \$40 billion in 1997 alone. That translates into over \$400 per household in higher costs for goods, services, and credit. That \$400 could buy every American family of four: 5 weeks of groceries, 20 tanks of unleaded gasoline, 10 pairs of shoes for the average grade-school child or more than 1 year's worth of disposable diapers.

Our Nation's bankruptcy laws play an important and necessary role in our society but we must ensure that our bankruptcy system does not unintentionally encourage those who can take responsibility for their financial obligations not to do so. Such an abuse of our bankruptcy laws is fundamentally unfair to those who play by the rules and take responsibility for their personal obligations. It has been estimated that 15 responsible borrowers are needed to cover the cost of a single bankruptcy.

The Responsible Borrower Protection Bankruptcy Act fundamentally reforms the existing bankruptcy system into a needs-based system. Only those who truly cannot repay their debts will be able to use the complete bankruptcy in chapter 7 of the Bankruptcy Code. Those who can repay their debts will have to use chapter 13 and work out a payment plan. Those who make less than 75 percent of the national median family income for a family of equal size will be presumed unable to repay their debts and may file complete bankruptcy. But those who make more than 75 percent of the national median family income for a family of equal size and, under a formula, are determined to be able to pay \$50 per month toward debt reduction of at least 20 percent of their unsecured, non-priority debt over 5 years may only file in chapter 13 and repay their debt over time.

This needs-based reform is intended to address a flaw in the bankruptcy system that encourages people to file for bankruptcy and walk away from debts, regardless of whether they are able to repay any portion of what they owe. Bankruptcy was never meant to be used as a financial planning tool or for mere convenience but it no longer carries with it the social stigma it did 20 years ago and these bankruptcies of convenience are driving the enormous increase in bankruptcies. Bankruptcy is becoming a first stop rather than a last resort.

The Responsible Borrower Protection Bankruptcy Act also makes reforms to reduce repeat filings and to prevent the gaming of the bankruptcy system, such as running up credit bills right before filing for bankruptcy or filing and dismissing a bankruptcy case as a stalling tactic. In addition, there are provisions to improve the efficient administration of bankruptcy cases, to increase oversight and to provide debtors with information about alternatives to bankruptcy, such as credit counseling services.

By ensuring that our bankruptcy laws are not abused, we also ensure that bankruptcy remains a viable last resort for those who have tried to pay their debts but were driven by circumstances to ask for judicial intervention into their personal finances. If we do not reform the system and stem the explosion in bankruptcy filings caused by bankruptcies of convenience, the cost of credit will inevitably increase while its availability will begin to decrease. Such a tightening of credit will especially impact the working poor. In addition, these reforms will protect those responsible borrowers who meet their financial obligations