

saving on their paycheck, they begin to acquire private property.

Then maybe they work with Habitat for Humanity or, the other pin I wear, Earning by Learning, a program to help poor children learn how to read; and in a few years they are on the road to prosperity, to becoming middle class, to becoming normal Americans engaged in the normal business of going to work and studying, and engaged in the normal process of having a home and having a better future.

We are committed. We think we proved with welfare that we can get a lot done. We are committed to continuing to work to get a lot done. I just believe, as our colleagues go home for the Easter break, that they are in a position to report on a very exciting agenda, to report on a very exciting success with welfare reform.

We are in a position to work on the Crossroads project, visiting local schools and other programs of excellence, conducting town meetings on education. We have a chance to have a school superintendent survey to establish an education advisory board to meet with our Governor and our State superintendent of education to talk about educational excellence.

I think we really have an opportunity on a bipartisan basis, and I hope every Democrat and every Republican will join in the Crossroads project, and contact Chairman HOEKSTRA and Chairman GOODLING to work on how to improve education.

I believe, based on the record of the last Congress, that we have proven that while it takes a while to get it done, if you keep working at it, it is amazing what we can get accomplished here in this Congress. We are going to build on our success with welfare reform, we are going to have more successes over the next 18 months.

I just think starting this weekend, Members have a chance during their district work period to really carry out a message of opportunity, a message of hope, and a message of working together as a team on a principled, bipartisan ship that gets good things done for America. That is my message for the Easter break that is coming up.

OUR EDUCATION CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the issue that I wanted to specifically comment on during this hour that I have is the education challenge which the Congress has faced in the past and must continue to face.

All of the polls that we have seen over the last year, or perhaps even longer, indicate that the American people are absolutely driven with the concern and worry about the fate of our educational system. When simply

brought into a room and asked to indicate what they think the most critical problem and issue this country faces in the next several years is, without any prompting, the vast majority of the persons that are questioned answer spontaneously, the education system.

So I believe that the Congress is correct in placing a very large emphasis on the educational goals for this Nation, and certainly our President is to be commended for highlighting his commitment to education, to support reform, to make it possible for more families to send their children to higher education, to make the educational opportunities real for families all across this country.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, with the national administration committed to support of education, with our local communities already engaged in the process of educational reform, that the Congress has a very great responsibility to develop a program which enhances the educational programs for our country.

In that context, it therefore disturbs me greatly when I am confronted, as the ranking Democrat member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, with an approach that is being sponsored by the majority, which is called Education at the Crossroads: What Works and What Doesn't Work, leading to the presumed conclusion that there is so much out there in education which is funded by the Federal Government that does not work that the Congress ought to pay heed and perhaps revamp the system of educational support.

I think that completely misstates the issue, Mr. Speaker. I have been advised that at various hearings that this subcommittee has held, and I only came to this position a few weeks ago, so I did not participate in the previous hearings, I went to one a few weeks ago in Delaware, but it is my distinct impression from talking to staff and others that the people who have come to testify and to give of their views and impressions about Federal programs in their area, that the Federal programs have worked very well; and that while there are some that perhaps could be altered or changed, or the emphasis switched to something else, most of the people who have come forward have indicated that the Federal programs are working.

Fundamentally, I think it is important also to understand that by and large, most of the Federal programs for education, at least in the elementary and secondary levels, are voluntary. The school systems, the States, the districts, come forward themselves to ask for funding, and they are given, by and large, a very large latitude in determining how these funds are to be spent.

They find the target areas, they develop the programs, they manage it, and of course, they have to account for the spending. We are not in a position

to allocate funds, even though they are voluntary, without examining how they are spent. That is really the responsibility of the oversight committee, which I joined. It is our responsibility to see how the moneys are spent. What works and what does not work is legitimate, but we are confronted by a document issued by the Republican majority, consisting of about 50 pages, and the repeated scenario both on the floor here and elsewhere, suggesting that there are just too many programs. We heard the Speaker here on the floor make mention of 760 education programs.

I have no idea where they obtained this list. Someone said it was probably the Library of Congress or some other source which collected this data. But it has no bearing or very little bearing to the Office of Education and to the areas of educational responsibility assigned to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, of which I am a member.

As far as I can determine from discussions with the Department of Education, they took a look at this list of 760 programs, and any of the Members interested might obtain a copy of this very easily by calling the majority staff of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and ask for this list of the so-called 760 education programs, and they will be surprised that the majority of the programs listed here are not in the Office of Education, not in the Department of Education at all.

The Department tells me that there are 298 identifiable programs out of the 760 that is often mentioned, 298 out of 760. So why do they go around the country saying they are 760 education programs? It is simply not true.

Out of the 298 programs that the Department says are listed in this document, 114 have already been eliminated, many of them eliminated in the list that Vice President GORE and President Clinton produced at the beginning of their first term. These have been defunded, eliminated, consolidated. They do not belong on any list. So the list for the most part is totally outdated and serves no particular purpose whatsoever.

At any rate, in the 760 programs listed in this document produced by the majority party, there are 184 programs, according to the U.S. Department of Education, that are legitimately listed as functions and programs that are currently administered by the U.S. Department of Education.

What else is in here that makes up the 760? It is important to know that they have listed all research programs, for instance, all training programs, anything having to do with a study activity. For instance, in agriculture, a long list of research programs are listed as well as other kinds of training grants in that Department, totaling 33 programs.

I am not a particular expert about the Department of Agriculture, so cannot analyze the 33 programs, but my

quick look at it indicates that they are probably grants that have been issued by the Department, but they are being listed as though they were programs that have to be managed by that Department.

The National Oceanic Administration, which has to do with the study of pollution and management and resources of our marine environment, is listed with 16 so-called education programs. Most of them, perhaps, are the collection of data or research or items of that kind which are terribly important, but they do not belong on an education list.

The Defense Department has 20 programs listed in this document, a lot of it having to do with research activities that the DOD conducts: information gathering, information disseminating, training programs within the Defense Department. They are not education programs, as such.

The Energy Department has 22 items listed. The Health and Human Services has 169 programs listed in this document, and they range from child welfare programs, substance abuse, AIDS prevention programs, programs for diabetes and so forth that the Speaker was making reference to, all of the Centers for Disease Control programs of research, terribly important to this country, but not education programs.

□ 1515

Indian health has 10 items here, and the NIH, which the Speaker was commending for supporting and increasing funding because it is so vital to the future health of this country, has 48 items in here. Does the chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce indicate by the listing of these 48 programs that these are excessive interventions in this area? I seriously doubt it. No one has taken the time to look through the 760 items on this list. If they did, I am sure this publication would never have been released.

We have the National Science Foundation, 16 items, Indian affairs has a score of items listed in this report, Indian health, Indian affairs under the Department of the Interior, many of them having to do with resource management, information, data collecting, health services, and so forth. The Transportation Department has 19 programs listed here. The Justice Department has 21. The Labor Department has 24, most of it having to do with job training services. Arts and Humanities has 33.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to take a look at this so-called 760 item list that has been frequently mentioned on the floor of this House and referenced by the Speaker as an indicator of the concerns that the majority has about the directions of the educational apparatus in the United States. For one, 760 programs are not in the Department of Education. At the most, 184 are. And they have to do with

elementary, secondary education, higher education, vocational education and all the things that are legitimate concerns.

So let us narrow the focus. If we wanted to truly see what is working and what is not working in education, let us refocus on the 184 programs and put away this diversionary tactic of suggesting to the American people that 760 programs are out there and that nobody knows anything about them. They are being managed by other Departments, and it is not the business of the Department of Education to go in and become the czar of all of this research, information gathering and try to manage it as a huge bureaucracy. That is absolutely antithetical to what the majority party believes anyway. They do not believe in this large type of management facility.

So this search for some kind of inquiry that would minimize the import of the Federal programs in education by suggesting that there are these 760 programs that are not being managed well is simply not true.

What we need to focus on in education is what really happens in the Federal funding mechanism. We hear a lot of criticism that the scores, the SAT scores are coming down, that the students are not performing well, that by other kinds of management or measurement techniques, the students are not doing as they should be doing and that our competitive status in the world is being threatened because education is functioning poorly.

Somehow in putting that criticism together about education and the concerns that have been expressed by parents and educators everywhere about the need for greater emphasis on quality education is lost in the debate because right now we are talking about 760 programs that really do not exist in our Department. So let us focus on what is really happening in education.

Most of the money for public education is coming from the local and State communities. It is not coming from the Federal Government. The average Federal contribution of the local-State budgets for education is somewhere around 6, 7, or 8 percent. That is all; 6, 7, or 8 percent of the total budget of the local school district or of a State is federally linked. The rest of the funds are coming from local taxes, local support or by the State governments in making contributions to the health, to the education of the children of that community. So the bulk of responsibility is in the local communities, in the management of the funds that they collect from their own taxes and from their own constituents.

The emphasis for the school-based management, the return of the management of your schools to parents and teachers and to the students arose from the fact that people felt that solutions and edicts and management suggestions coming from on top were not necessarily applicable to local school districts or even to individual schools.

And so the strength of the parent movement has suggested that parents and teachers in a local school environment ought to be given greater authority to determine the kinds of educational thrusts that the school ought to have, how it was to spend its money, what kinds of additional courses needed to be added onto the program and to individualize the budget process on a school-by-school basis.

Many areas have done this. My own State is one of the early pioneers in school-based management concepts. I believe to a large extent it has worked. The fundamental principle there is local school control. They make the decisions. So in this apparent decision to go across the country to determine what works and what does not work does not fit into this whole pattern which we have established over the last decade. A program may work well in one area, but that does not mean one size fits all and we are to take that program and try to replicate it, clone it so that everybody else follows that same pattern. That is precisely what the parent-teacher model is specifically opposed to. Every school situation is different. They may want to emphasize different areas of study or they may have different problems that they need to deal with in their school environment.

So while the search of what works and what does not work is important, it certainly is not to find that premium program, that absolutely great idea that works in one area and expect to replicate it throughout the Nation. I think that that is absolutely contrary to this whole notion of local responsibility and local decisionmaking. So our search for what works and what does not work ought to be for our own information in enabling us to determine what kinds of programs we ought to emphasize and what programs we ought to be sponsoring under the Federal auspices.

Now, in much of the discussion that I have heard on the floor presented by the chairman of my Committee on House Oversight, he frequently has a large map and he points to the bureaucracy that is suggested by this map in Washington and argues that the moneys that are being allocated to education are not being spent for the education of our children. In other words, it is not going to the classroom, it is not paying the teacher's salaries and, therefore, "It is being wasted inside the beltway in this humongous bureaucracy."

Well, a simple search of the statistics in the Department will tell us immediately that the Department of Education has probably the smallest overhead manpower pool of any Cabinet position in any of the recent administrations. The Secretary tells me that roughly about 2 percent of the moneys that pass through the U.S. Department of Education is spent in personnel in Washington for the management and administration of the funding process. That is a very small amount of money.

So second, I want to debunk this idea that the moneys that the Congress has appropriated for education is somehow being wasted, on 760 programs, because that is not true; and second, in the overly heavy administration or bureaucratic mechanism somehow in place here in Washington. It is not true and I invite Members to look at the details and arrive at their own judgment.

The budget process is extremely important, and I heard the Speaker again make a challenge to the President that he come back with another budget which is balanced. That is an extraordinary request. Basically what I think it does is to confess failure on the part of the majority to have their own budget to come forward which is balanced by the year 2002. That is their basic responsibility. The Constitution requires us to be the manager of the funds and revenues of this Government and to do allocations for the programs that we feel are necessary.

The President of the United States, on the other hand, merely submits his proposal. He does not enact it. We do. He proposes. He suggests how he would like to see the revenues of this country spent on the various programs that he favors. I am pleased that he came forward with very large increases for education.

I believe the President's budget will be balanced in 5 years, 2002. It is difficult for anyone sitting in this Chamber or anywhere else in the country to specifically guarantee that any budget will actually balance out because budgets that are based upon 5-year forecasts are nothing more than forecasts. They are projections. They are based upon assumptions of what the economy is going to be like next year and the year after that and the year after that, how much revenues are going to be forthcoming into the Treasury, how much unemployment there is going to be in the country that might cause a reduction in the receipts or the necessity to pay out unemployment compensation or perhaps other kinds of effects. Inflation might rear its ugly head, for instance, and diminish the strength of our economy and the gross national product might not be as vigorous as is anticipated by this administration.

They have every right to be proud of the projections they have made over the past 4 years. Their projections were always criticized as being too rosy, too affirmative in terms of what the outlooks were going to be down the road 4 or 5 years. But it has turned out that the administration's budgetary forecasts have been very conservative and that the deficits which they projected were far too high. In fact, the actual deficits were far below what they even thought it would be.

Consequently, to attack the President's budget document because it does not balance in the year 2002 is quite an incredulous performance and really, I think, confesses the absence of the majority party to have their own document forthcoming.

Under the statute which governs the budget process, and we could criticize the process interminably, but the process is here and we are required to follow it, and that process says on April 15 the majority has to come forth with a budget resolution. We have yet to take it up in the committee.

In addition to serving on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I also serve on the Committee on the Budget, and so it is interesting to me that we have engaged in this banter about asking the President to come forward with another budget. He does not have to. He submitted one. He says he believes it is balanced. Even the Republican designated head of the Congressional Budget Office in a letter to the Senate said in her view the budget was basically in balance and that there would be a deficit of zero in the fifth year.

□ 1530

So the CBO having said that, it seems to me that the majority ought to accept that letter and move forward and produce their budget document for this House to consider, as it is required to do, at least by the 15th of April. We are about to go on a long recess, not due back until the 7th of April, so in that period, which is called the district work period, I hope that the leadership on the majority side will rethink their responsibility and work vigorously to produce a budget that they can defend and which is equally conservative and balances out in the year 2002. I think that is something they owe not only this body but also the American people, all that rhetoric notwithstanding.

The budget process is very complicated and subject to a lot of misunderstanding. I for one very strongly support the capital budget idea. The Speaker made reference to the fact that people manage their own family budgets and have to live within the moneys that they earn and that just as families are required to do this, the Federal Government ought to do the same. That sounds like a very simple message, but it is far from the truth.

Families do not live on the income that they earn, and that is the plain fact. Most families, if they want to own a home, go to the bank and borrow, if they want to enjoy a quality of life. They go to the bank and get a mortgage for \$300,000 or \$400,000 and enjoy a home that they will eventually pay for in perhaps 30 years. They go to the bank and borrow to make sure that the best quality education is afforded their children.

Businesses in America do not grow and expand and become prosperous on a cash balance basis. Their strength as a business is measured by their ability to go to the bank and borrow a million dollars or \$5 million to capitalize their business and expand and generate jobs and be productive. Their wealth is determined on their ability to get this capital funding in order to finance their ventures, and this borrowing extends over a fairly long period of time.

State governments, local governments also have found it necessary to borrow under a capital budget idea. My own State, for instance, has a constitutional requirement that the operating budget must be balanced, but that the State may also through its legislative branch approve the borrowing for capital improvements, roads, highways, airport facilities, a huge convention center, an oceanfront development, university structures and athletic facilities and so forth. All of these are now enjoyed by the community because the State has taken upon itself the ability to go out and sell bonds and to build these physical structures.

The Federal budget, on the other hand, is very unique. It does not have a separate capital budget, and yet we all know that a very large hunk of the Defense Department, of the space and aeronautics budget, the transportation budget, the airport budget, numerous other areas of our budgetary documents are filled with capital projects.

Why is it that the Federal Government only has to come up with the cash, pay-as-you-go concept? It seems to me that that is really the basis of our difficulty. If we truly have a zero deficit constitutional amendment, balanced budget means a zero deficit, it will completely hamstring, strait-jacket the Federal Government and its ability to go out into the market and borrow for necessary capital improvements.

I hope that a day will come when the Congress and the administration can sit down and discuss the merits of implementing a capital budget, because that is the way to go. Then I believe we could adopt a statute, an amendment, a whatever, that would require that our operating programs, year after year operating and paying for the services that the people expect of their Government, would be in a budget which is balanced and shows no deficit but would allow the Government to go out and borrow for defense purposes, for acquisition of strategic weapons, go to Mars or whatever, build the facilities of infrastructure for our highways and airports as a necessary, without confronting the overage year after year on the negative side in our budget. I think that that is the way to go and I hope that our discourse will take us at that point.

Talking about the budget, I think it is important, if I may just refer to this chart, for people to understand where we are in terms of education funding. I do not think that the vast majority of people in the country understand the significance of this diagram, but this is what we are stuck with in terms of what we can budget in our debates here in the Congress.

Defense spending, although it is discretionary and comes up to about \$266 billion, is not likely to be reduced by the Congress. It could be, theoretically, but it is basically a fixed allocation, and the chance of reducing it so that we could fund something else is very, very remote.

The interest that we pay on our past debts, which is over \$5 trillion, is also an area over which we have no control. The interest must be paid, the moneys were borrowed, and that is a Federal financial responsibility, and that is 14 percent of the budget at \$248 billion.

Social Security as part of the budget, it is a fixed requirement. It costs 21 percent of the budget. \$364 billion must be paid out to beneficiaries who are eligible in the system, and there are no ifs, ands or buts about it, it is a fixed obligation. We do not appropriate it in the budget at all. It is an entitlement.

The same is true for Medicare and Medicaid. Both of them are strict requirements for funding: Medicare at \$209 billion, which is 12 percent of the budget; Medicaid, \$99 billion at 6 percent of the budget. These are fixed requirements and their expenditures are dependent upon the number of eligible people who come in to get those services.

There are other kinds of entitlements, 14 percent, \$244 billion. Those are the retirements, civil service retirement, military retirements and other items such as that which are not part of our budget process.

This small little pie-shaped sector here is all that is left and all that we labor to appropriate in the budget process. All the rest of it is, in my view, fixed items of allocation. We are debating 16 percent of the total budget, or \$288 billion, and out of this amount, out of this \$288 billion must come all the range of services in Justice, in Commerce, in Interior, in Agriculture, in research, in NIH, in Health and Human Services, in Education and Labor. So that is where this struggle comes in terms of the budget process.

Anyone that suggests that education funding is excessive and should be cut back really has not focused on the small amount of money that is allocated for education. It is an incredibly small amount of money, something in the range of 2 percent of the funding. I had a chart here, but I seem to have misplaced it. Education funding roughly is about 5 percent of the discretionary and 2 percent of the total Federal budget. It is a very small part of the total expenditure. The total Federal budget is \$1.5 trillion, and the education budgeting as of fiscal year 1997, last year, was somewhere around \$28 billion, which is not very much.

In this education budget, you can see how the funding is allocated. Local educational agencies receive 39 percent; State educational agencies receive 13 percent; college students receive 16 percent of the total funding; institutions of higher learning, about 15.6 percent; other kinds of group agencies, 6 percent. The Federal share, and that is what the Republican Chair of the Oversight Committee is making reference to, the overhead in Washington, the Federal share of the total Department of Education outlays is a mere 1.8 percent, or roughly 2 percent of the total budget, which is the low-

est, I am told, of any Cabinet agency in the Government.

There is not an excessive bureaucracy and the funding is very low. Anyone that suggests that too much money is going into education simply has not taken a look at the overall budget. Two percent of the total budget for education is woefully inadequate.

All the discussion and the voices that you hear constantly is that education is the most important responsibility of our society, to translate to the future our children's ability to compete in business and in trade and in global interactions. If that is true, and the future of this country is to be in the hands of the children whom we have the responsibility to educate, do you not think 2 percent of the Federal budget is woefully inadequate, 5 percent of the discretionary is woefully inadequate?

So I hope in this one area, particularly in this one area, that there can be a concerted effort on both sides of the aisle to come together with a committed program of support for education. We may differ on the emphasis, but let us not waste time pointing fingers at the Department and challenging them to reduce their bureaucracy when it is the smallest of any Cabinet agency, or alleging that there are 760 programs when in fact there are only 184. Take a serious look at those 184 and see how we can expand their impact if they are good, eliminate them if they are bad, and continue on the steady march of increasing and focusing and targeting the Federal support for education on the neediest students in our country and those programs that school districts have the greatest difficulty in funding because of the excessive cost.

It seems to me we can join hands on that simple agenda and create a great deal of good for this country and make tremendous progress.

I shall join the Republicans on their hearings across the country on Education at the Crossroads, because I believe that the people who will come forth to testify will support the Federal presence in education. It is so small. It is a minutia in the totality of responsibility that local school districts have; 6, 7, 8 percent is not a great deal of the funding, and most of it is voluntary. They get to use the money in whatever capacities they deem best, and so the essence of local control and flexibility is there for them to manage.

We should listen to these school officials, because we have much to learn. We still do not know why, for instance, the National Assessment of Educational Progress report on math recently shows certain schools are very high on the list and other schools are very low. My own State scored very low, and I am distressed by seeing our State listed at the bottom quarter of the list.

□ 1545

Many educators and administrators will say, "Well, those kinds of report

cards don't mean anything. They're probably based on erroneous data or old data or whatever." That may be true, but it seems to me that if one is seriously interested in looking at what is happening to education and how the States are dealing with it, the statistics that are put forth are very important and that we ought to pay attention to it. That does not mean we have to abide by everything that is said in it, but it is certainly a lesson to heed.

The recent report that was published January 22, Education Week in collaboration with the Pugh charitable trusts, called "Quality Counts: A Report Card on the Condition of Public Education in 50 States," is a document which I urge you all to obtain and to study very carefully if you are interested in education as a student, as a parent, as a member of a board of education or in the school system as an administrator or a teacher, or someone who is an elected legislator or whatever. The materials that are contained in this educational report are very instructive. You could probably find nitpicking reasons for discarding this particular analysis or that analysis, but the tables that are presented in this report which rank each State in the performance based upon a whole range of criteria is very, very instructive.

I found it instructive trying to see where my State placed, for instance, in the math scores that were recently released under NAPE'S and found that my State ranked in the lower fourth. It is very disturbing. The best part of the report said that we probably had the highest advances in the last 6 years in terms of the scores, so that is something of a positive note. But I think we should look at these statistics and learn from them what we are doing in our schools in teaching math.

Certainly it is not the Federal Government going into the schools teaching math. We hardly ever even fund math per se. We might fund title I, which takes moneys into the economically disadvantaged school areas to try to help students in those communities, but math as such is not a Federal program as far as I can determine. So looking at math, NAPE'S has picked out one area of performance by the students, fourth grade and eighth grade. They did this 6 years ago, and they just released their report now. They do the same for reading. It is important, I think, for us to look at the reading scores and to see how one ranks.

It has in the report the average per pupil expenditure; very, very interesting to see the States that are spending a considerable amount of money and what the results are in terms of academic achievements. One of the States that I looked at was New Jersey. Their average per pupil expenditure is \$8,118. That is a very large per pupil expenditure. My own State is around \$5,000, so it is significantly larger. The report says that 60 percent of those moneys that New Jersey spends for education goes directly into instruction, contrary

to what the Republicans on my committee have alleged. This report indicates overall about 60 percent of all school funding is for instructional services.

Now we know to run a school requires a whole lot of other expenses. You have the school lunch program, you have the maintenance program, you have the building program, you have all these other extras. In some cases you might even have to have a police officer and other kinds of protective mechanisms added. So to find a school that is spending out of its \$8,118 per pupil expenditure 60 percent that goes into instruction is very, very laudatory.

Another statistic contained in this report, and you can do this for every State; in New Jersey, the percent of teachers with 25 or less students. That was 63 percent of their school population. This is another point that they need to be commended for. My State has somewhere around 40 percent only of teachers with 25 or less students. So we have a far distance to go to achieve that record.

The average teacher's salary in New Jersey is \$38,422, and it is probably one of the highest in the country. New York is a little higher. The average teacher's salary in New York is \$41,157.

So these States and communities combined are making a tremendous effort to put education at the top. People in a very derisive kind of voice say you cannot throw money at a problem and expect to solve it. In the instance of education I believe that funding education is primarily the way to improve it and to develop quality education. One way you do that is to hire teachers that are qualified to teach, and they have a chart in this report showing how many teachers in high school are not qualified to teach the subjects that they have been assigned by the system, and you can certainly predict that those students are not going to do well if the teacher is not a qualified teacher.

So the teacher enhancement program, the average teacher salary, the amount of money that is going into the system are, it seems to me, key elements for success.

Why I pick New Jersey is that 97 percent of their public high schools offer advanced placement. Advanced placement is one of the criteria used in this report to determine the kind of initiative and thrust in quality education that the school system is placing on instruction, and so the schools that are putting their money into advanced placement turn out students that excel. And so here you have New Jersey at 97 percent AP courses. New York has an 83 percent advanced placement course. So they are doing well. The average per pupil expenditure in New York is 7,173 with a teacher average salary of \$41,157.

The No. 1 ranking State in this report in terms of—excuse me, not in this report, in the NAPE'S report for 1996

on mathematics, the No. 1 scoring State, and I have to commend that State, is Minnesota. Minnesota placed first in the outcome of the examination on math for their fourth graders and for their eighth graders. So surely they must be doing something right in Minnesota, and we need to go there to see what it is so that we can inspire other school districts to do the same; not to use the example of Minnesota to force-feed a program for the rest of the Nation on a one size fits all, but to learn from the instructional program in Minnesota how it is they have done so well in the instruction of math and to excel year after year in the command their students have of this very, very important subject. Math and science together is really the path to the future if we are to be competitive with our foreign counterparts. The average teacher's salary in Minnesota is \$37,570, so that is an indication also of their tremendous support.

Sixty-four percent of the moneys that they collect and spend in education go for instruction, and their average per pupil expenditure is \$6,983.

So there is much that I commend to you in this Education Week. Let us not just look and hear the rhetoric and expect that that is the fact or that is the truth. Let us examine Education Week, look for your State's performance. There are dozens and dozens of criteria which have been used to make the evaluation, some of it more relevant to some situations and some perhaps not. But it is certainly a way to start an oversight investigation course which takes us across the country to make this examination.

The Speaker in one of his remarks made reference to the fact that we might do away with bilingual education. I take strong issue against such a proposal. Bilingual education is to teach people how to read and write and think in English. You cannot abandon this program with the expectation that by doing so and forcing students who are not proficient in English coming to the class, perhaps speaking at home in another language, to be able to accomplish and learn what they are required to learn. Performance would be disastrously lowered if we did not have this accompanying program which allows the students to make a transition from the language that they are familiar with and use at home or a language that they use outside the classrooms. To bring that language in and to make it the source of instruction for mastery of English is really the philosophy of the bilingual education.

So I hope that the Republicans will reexamine that issue and not come up for its eradication.

The House will be debating this week the matter of flexible time for families. Again the Speaker made reference to their strong belief in families first and their desire to allow families the option to take a sick child to the doctor or to go to school to discuss their children's performance in school with the

teachers and other school personnel or to take an aging parent somewhere. These are all laudable reasons for allowing people to get time from their employers to do this important work. It seems to me that employers throughout the country have that compassion and are willing to make time available. But the flex time bill, H.R. 1 that we will be debating this week, does not come close at all to this aspiration that families have for flexible time.

It seems to me it is very simple for employers to say, "OK, you have to do this for a couple of hours. You can stay late the next day." That is flexible time. There is no pay loss or anything of that kind. But H.R. 1, the compensatory time bill that is coming forth for debate, does not guarantee the employee his or her choice of the use of that extra time.

I like to refer to the bill as the repeal of Saturday and Sunday. You know under the Fair Labor Standards Act we had the guarantee that people could only be worked 40 hours a week. That meant you freed up Saturday and Sunday to be with the family. Long ago, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed, we had the feeling about families first and they ought to have time to be with their families to enjoy the family situation. If you have an employer that is going to require overtime work and not have to pay wages in time and a half and have the option of giving time and a half time off at his, the employer's, choice, this is not flexibility for the worker at all. In my committee we tried to make it more flexible, more at the option, more at the choice of the employee, but each time we offered those amendments they were struck down.

Consider yourself as an employee being asked by your employer to stay late, work Saturdays and Sundays because there is a job order that has to go out, the business is in great jeopardy if the schedule is not met. There is no way that you would turn down your employer. You would work the extra hours.

□ 1600

You would work the extra hours. You would have to be away from your family the extra hours. That is not flexible time. That is working for no compensation at all, because the offer is work overtime and at some point later you will get time and a half off at the option of the employer. That is not fair.

If it is truly family first, family flexible, then the employee ought to be able to say, well, I want to take my time and a half next week, because I want to be with my children over their Easter break. There should not be any allowance on the part of the employer to say, no, I have to decide for comp time at a later point.

Under the bill, 260 hours of compensatory time can be saved, it can be put aside for each worker. That is a total of 160 hours of work without pay, and

time and a half of that 80 hours would be the time and a half factor accumulation of 240 hours that you cannot decide when you are going to take, and the employer will have 12 months in which to decide when to give it to you. That is not flexible time. That is a diminution of quality time with your family, that is working without compensation for a promise of compensatory time off 12 months hence.

The tragedy also is that for many workers, overtime compensation at time and a half is what they depend on to be able to pay for the expenses and make ends meet. So to have a bill that will take this away would be truly a hurtful kind of legislation.

The problems with comp time also go to the whole bankruptcy issue. Compensatory time off is not wages, and therefore it does not go into the computation of Social Security benefit time earned. And if the company goes bankrupt because the company truly was in distress, and files bankruptcy, as an employee owed compensatory time, not wages, you will not get any priority payment whatsoever.

This is a bill fraught with a great deal of potential harm and damage to working families, and does not meet, absolutely does not meet, the promise of flex time and family first, which the Republicans are touting.

As a worker I want to have my Saturdays and Sundays off, and if I am required to work either an extra 2 hours or so during the week or on weekends, I want to have the absolute right to decide whether I want it in wages or whether I am willing to take it as compensatory time off, and the time off should be at my option.

If the bill can be drafted to make those assurances, I am sure that most

of us will find a happy circumstance in joining with the Republicans. But as I see it, the misfortune of so many workers under this legislation would be forced employment, no wages, and compensatory time off at the will of the employer after a 12-month period.

That I think is unfair, unjustified, and I do not want to see the Fair Labor Standards Act protection of workers' 40-hour week, and time and a half compensation, which is attributable to Social Security credits and to bankruptcy protections and all other means for determining benefits, being jeopardized under a comp time concept.

So this debate this week should be very, very lively, and I look forward to the minority side having an opportunity to debate it and to advance our objections to this proposal.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ROGAN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CANADY of Florida for 5 minutes each day, on March 18 and 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mrs. MINK of Hawaii) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LANTOS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROGAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. COMBEST.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. HYDE in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MINK of Hawaii) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. LEWIS of California in three instances.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. BONIOR in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, 1997, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various committees, House of Representatives, during the 4th quarter of 1996 in connection with official foreign travel, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Charles Rangel	12/12	12/15	China
Commercial airfare	1,909.98	1,909.98
Committee total	1,909.98	1,909.98

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL ARCHER, Chairman, Feb. 12, 1997.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Jim Kolbe	12/7	12/9	Hong Kong	776.00	(3)	776.00
.....	12/9	12/13	Singapore	1,092.00	4,229.95	5,321.95
Hon. Joe Skeen	12/5	12/6	United States	135.00	135.00
.....	12/8	12/9	New Zealand	238.00	238.00
.....	12/9	12/16	Australia	1,501.50	1,501.50
.....	12/15	12/18	United States	510.00	510.00
Commercial airfare	7,743.65	7,743.65
Frank Cushing	12/6	12/13	New Zealand	950.00	950.00