

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

There was no objection.

EDUCATION EXCELLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am joined by a number of my colleagues to talk about what my other colleagues were talking about in the previous hour, and that is education. And rather than going through a long introduction, I want to start right off with a quote that the President of the United States made on March 27, 1996. This was in a response to the Governors Summit on Education: Education Excellence. And the President said, and I cannot agree with him more, "We cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we have got now."

This is the President of the United States about a year ago. That remark, along with some of the debate in Congress in 1996, led the committee that I chair, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to begin a project, which we call education at a crossroads, to ask and to find out what are we accomplishing and achieving with the money that we are spending today.

We started with a very basic question. We said, how many education programs are there?

□ 1745

Went to the Education Department because, of course, in Washington we coordinate all of the education programs through one department. Wrong. We found out that they go through 39 different agencies. We have over 760 different programs, and we are spending over or in the neighborhood of \$100 billion per year on education today.

That is a very appropriate question to ask. It is the question that we must answer before we expand the 760. Actually, I think as we have worked on this, it is now over 780 programs, we now have to take a look at the 780 programs, the \$100 billion that we are spending, the 39 different agencies that this money is flowing through, because the focus here should not be on an education bureaucracy. Our focus needs to be on the kids. Before we have 10 new programs with \$50 billion of more spending, we need to take a look at whether and where this money is going and whether we are having an impact with it or not. We do not want to pour \$50 billion through a broken system.

Mr. Speaker, I have got some of my colleagues with me tonight to talk about this very issue. I would like to have one of my colleagues from Pennsylvania just briefly explain to us, we will have a dialogue, more of a dia-

logue tonight so that we can build off each other's comments about what is going on in education because we all have our own perspectives and our own learning about what is going on and we have got six of us here tonight. We will be able to share perspectives and learn from each other.

Tomorrow my colleague from Pennsylvania is going to be introducing or announcing a resolution that I think gets at the very issue about doing some important work to find out the kind of impact that we are having with the dollars today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak really on behalf of millions of students, teachers, administrators and many Members of Congress to discuss one of the most important components of our American society, and that is our education system. I would like to talk about what can and should become an American initiative, sending more dollars to our Nation's classrooms.

Every citizen of this Nation agrees that children deserve an opportunity to excel. But this opportunity is inhibited when teachers and administrators are hampered by paperwork, time constraints and financial hindrances just to apply for Federal education grants. Tomorrow, as my colleague said, I will introduce a resolution entitled the dollars to the classroom resolution, calling for the Department of Education to provide more elementary and secondary dollars to the classrooms of our Nation's children.

My resolution calls for a change in the way we spend our Federal education dollars. For too long, Americans' hard-earned tax dollars have gone to bureaucracy and have churned through the Washington labyrinth instead of rightfully being placed into the classrooms, into the hands of someone who knows the name of your child.

Of the \$15.4 billion which goes to elementary and secondary programs, in the Federal Department of Education, the classroom may be lucky to see 65 percent. That means about \$5.4 billion is lost in the abyss of department studies, publications and grant administration.

To apply for a Department of Education grant, it takes nearly 216 steps, an average of 21 weeks. That is over 5 months of work for someone on the local level just to apply for a Federal grant.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, is that 21 weeks before they may ever get an answer from the Education Department as to whether they are going to receive a grant?

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Education Department very recently highlighted this as a significant accomplishment, getting it down to 21 weeks and 216 steps. I think until the Vice President became involved in this process, it

took 26 weeks and over 400 steps. But this is what the Education Department calls significant progress and moving towards education excellence by shortening the process of finding out whether a school district is actually going to have a grant accepted after they go through 216 steps and after 21 weeks.

Mr. PITTS. That is correct.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, that is improvement. It may be improvement, but it is still not very good.

Mr. PITTS. As a former classroom teacher myself, I know that it would not be very encouraging to me to have to spend hours upon hours to apply for something that I had no guarantee of receiving.

But I think Americans would rather see their tax dollars at work providing more teachers, teacher aides, purchasing materials, supplies, updated software, calculators, textbooks, and even seeing the American classroom connected to the Internet brought into the new information age. The classroom is where the action is. The classroom is where knowledge grows and learning takes place.

This dollars to the classroom initiative would call upon the Federal Department of Education and State and local agencies to see that 95 cents of every Federal dollar would get to the local school district. And of those Federal dollars that get to the local school district, 95 cents of every Federal dollar would get into the classroom, into the hands of someone that knows your child's name. If this actually happened, roughly \$1,800 more could be available in each classroom across the United States.

We heard the quote from President Clinton that we cannot ask Americans to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money that we have got now. And for \$10 to purchase flash cards, a student could practice her timetables with a friend. For \$50 for a globe or a set of maps, children improve their geography, their knowledge of nations across the seas. For \$1,500, we can buy a computer with enough desk top space and Internet access to allow every student access to a vast amount of information available at their fingertips.

So this really is about kids, about practical ways to see that they benefit from Federal education tax dollars. I think for the sake of our Nation's kids, we should all put our children first.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has taken kind of a revolutionary approach. He is focusing getting dollars to the classroom, getting them to the kids, getting them to the teachers, to the local administration where they can actually make an impact.

The other visual that we use frequently here, this is a picture of Washington, DC. I know my colleague is a freshman but I know that he is very well aware that when we walk across this street over here and we walk to the Capitol to vote, we call it Independence Avenue. That is what the

street is called. But along this road are what, all of the bureaucracies that now are controlling so much of what goes on in our local neighborhoods. We think we ought to rename the street Dependence Avenue until we change that culture.

What would the gentleman's legislation, what kind of impact would it have on the people that work here on Dependence Avenue?

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, it would limit the amount of money they could take of our Federal education dollars that we put in the budget and consume on the bureaucracy. As we know, most funding for our local schools comes from the State and local levels, only about 7 percent comes from the Federal Government. But we need to be more efficient as to how we utilize those Federal dollars. This would in effect drive those dollars through the bureaucracy, Federal, State bureaucracy into the classroom. It would deny them access to that.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think what many of us have seen as we have met with school administrators and around in our districts, we constantly hear that these buildings and these people here in Washington, all with good intentions but who control about 7 percent of the flow of the dollars to our local classrooms, generate 50 percent of the paperwork. For every dollar that we give them, they keep somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 to 40 cents and they send 60 to 70 cents to our kids.

What we are saying is we agree with the President. We ought to take a look at where the dollars are going, and before we pour another dollar into this building and only get 60 cents out, we ought to see exactly the bang that we are getting. If we can get that up to 90 cents, we do not have to increase taxes, the tax burden; we will just be helping our kids.

I know that my colleague from Kentucky would like to participate, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Kentucky [Mrs. Northup].

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I would. I have been very interested in education myself as a mother of six children, as a member of the Kentucky State legislature, on the education and the Committee on Appropriations. I have had a long-standing involvement with the education. Kentucky had the courage and worked very hard in 1990, enacted in fact one of the largest taxes in their history in order to fund their schools. It is often pointed to as the example of school reform that we ought to look to on the Federal level.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman actually believes school reform can happen at the local and the State level better than at the Federal level.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Actually the whole key to Kentucky's education reform act is that children learn one child at a time, one classroom at a time, one school at a time, and one district at a time. The closer the effective edu-

cation occurs and the decisions are made to that child and that teacher and that classroom, the more effective schools will be and the more effective the learning decisions that are made will be.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly was interested in the President's America Reads program. First of all, one of the first weeks of the Committee on Appropriations on education, we had before us the National Institutes of Health. This is the research arm that the Federal Government spends so many billions of dollars on. They have done a great deal of research in the last couple of years on how children read and what the problems are with reading. They have come to the conclusion that children who have trouble learning to read, there are some children that will learn in any system, but children who have trouble need intensive phonics instruction. And yet this America Reads, one of the problems is we have so many teachers who have not come through a phonics-based system. So retraining them is a big issue.

This America Reads program is almost as though the people that originated this idea did not read our own government's research. It is out of context of any phonics. It is out of context of understanding that very structured phonics is the way these children can best learn.

They, in particular, found that if you mix it with whole language or not stylized instruction that it confuses the child so we are not only wasting money we are chancing that we are going to undo the very thing that our research shows is the most effective way of teaching children to read.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, we have also had the opportunity to go around the country and have hearings. One of the first hearings we had was in California, where we had a number of the chief administrators from a lot of the colleges in California come and testify.

What they told us is, do not cut remedial education. You are sitting there and you are thinking, this is higher ed, what are we teaching remedial education at higher ed for?

And so we asked and we said, what are you teaching? They said, well, 25 percent of the students that we get coming into our universities, 25 percent, one out of four, cannot read or write at an eighth grade level.

It is kind of like, the President is proposing America Reads, which is the tutors and all of that, and the, you take, you peel away a little bit in California and what you found is they left phonics, they went to whole language. Did not work. Got a generation of kids now that are scoring some of the lowest scores in the country. Nobody is taking a look at what is going on in the classroom where the kids are spending 6 to 8 hours per day, and we should be focusing on them.

The message of the college administrators was, get back into the class-

room. Do not ask for more remedial education money. Your job is to get back into the classroom and find out why those teachers that you have trained are giving such disappointing results with the kids that they are teaching all day. It is kind of like, get to the basics, get dollars in the classroom and local control.

Mrs. NORTHUP. I think it goes back to the theme, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman talked about, about why spend more of our tax dollars if we cannot make effective the tax dollars we already spend on education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Americans are committed to education, and I believe that they care deeply about children learning, particularly learning to read. So let us look at the proven ways. Let us leave education where it can be changed, according to the research, and that is with local control and local efforts.

Let us not add a program that is unproven, untested, where the research shows there essentially would be no effect on kids learning.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Let us listen to the President and understand what works and what does not before we add any new programs and ask the American taxpayer to spend more money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] who may have a comment.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

We are in the process of a lot of things going on at once and there are a couple of things that I felt would be important for me to say to the gentleman.

Number one, I am very pleased with the gentleman's Crossroads at Education program, because I know that the gentleman is trying to find out and we are as a committee trying to find out what works and what does not.

Secondly, I would like to thank the gentleman for providing us the opportunity to have a hearing on this just last week in Milledgeville, GA. I know that the gentleman could not be there because of a death in his family, but I wanted to come, on behalf of the people of Georgia, and my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL], who was also there, and say that people I talked to in Georgia said thanks.

□ 1800

This is the first time in their memory or their knowledge that Congress has ever had an education hearing in Georgia. It is the first time they know of, that anybody from Congress ever came and asked them what they think.

We were talking to some people who are very, very involved in education in Georgia, and I wanted to come and tell the gentleman a few things they have said during the hearing so that the gentleman is able to respond to them.

Our superintendent, our State superintendent of schools, for example, said, and I quote, "The most frequent message I have heard is that no one can

make better decisions about local education than parents, teachers, and students in the local communities." Now this is our State school superintendent.

She goes on to say, and I quote, "Administrators in Washington will never meet the needs of individual children. I cast my vote for returning as many dollars directly to the local schools as we are able to do."

Now, I think what we are doing is trying to have an adult conversation about improving education. Everybody in the 10th District of Georgia believes in that. We all believe that that is the future for the 21st century, but we all do not necessarily agree on how to get there.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman clearly points out that we all do care about education.

We have developed a kind of a monthly brochure or briefer here which we call A Tale of Two Visions, because there are at least two very different beliefs on how to move education forward in our country. I think we believe that moving decision-making and dollars back to the children, back to the parents, and back to the teachers is the way to go.

There is another whole group of people here in Washington that believe in moving more power, authority, money into the buildings here in Washington, so that they can issue rules and regulations on "how to" to the local levels, and saying that parents and teachers and principals can be good teachers and good principals and good parents by reading manuals and saying this is what Washington wants you to do.

That is not the vision that we have in mind, and I do not think that is the vision the gentleman heard in Georgia.

Mr. NORWOOD. No, I did not. But we are in the discovery process. We are trying to hear from all sides and everybody to determine what kind of recommendations we might make to Congress.

In the 104th Congress, or certainly in 1996, we basically did not reform education. We are still number 13 on the planet in math. We will not win in the 21st century if we continue to do that. We still have at least 50 percent of the children who are graduating with a high school degree that are illiterate or cannot read their diploma. We will not win with China if we continue to do that.

It does not help, in this time when we are trying to discover what to do and hear all sides, when groups of people stand up and politicize and demagogue the issue. That is why nothing happened in the last Congress.

Let me just point out that during our hearing, the very time we were having a hearing trying to discover what works and what does not, we had a gentleman from Texas sending news releases down into our district saying, "Oh, we cannot do any of that because they want to simply shut down the Department of Education." That does not

lead to an intelligent dialogue that will lead to solutions where we can reform education and improve our lot in this country.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for his comments. He points out some statistics that tell us we need a meaningful dialogue on education because our kids are not getting the kind of results that we would like them to be achieving and the kind of results that we need for them to be able to be successful in a world economy.

I think my colleague from Colorado had a few statistics of his own, and we will get to our colleague from North Carolina, because I know what he wants to talk about and we will get there. But I think my colleague from Colorado had some statistics, again, that talk about the less than satisfactory results we are getting out of our educational system today.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The gentleman from Georgia mentioned where we rank nationally with respect to mathematics. Actually, that number has been upgraded, or renewed. I should not say upgraded, because it was not like that at all.

The Third International Mathematics and Science Study came out recently. This is a comparison of how our students here in the United States compare with 41 other industrialized countries. This is the same report our President, right up here at the top podium during the State of the Union address, referred to and spoke of our great need to improve by it.

I want to tell my colleagues what this says because it is quite disturbing, and I do not think many Americans have any idea where we are headed as a country.

In this international comparison, again this is the third time this has been done, 41 industrialized countries, out of those 41 countries in mathematics we rank 28th. In science we do a little better. In science the United States ranks 17th.

Now, let me just read some of the names of the countries that outperform us in math and science. First, there is Denmark, Norway; there is Sweden, Israel, Thailand, Belgium, Australia, Russia, Hungary. Hungary is at No. 14. Remember, we are at No. 28. Bulgaria, Austria, Slovenia outperform us in math. Slovakia. The Czech Republic is No. 6 in math. Again, we are at 28 out of 41 countries. Belgium, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea. The No. one country performing in mathematics for their elementary aged students is Singapore.

In science, again I mentioned we are a little bit better. Slovakia is still better than us. Belgium is better than us. Hungary, Austria, Slovenia, Bulgaria, South Korea, Japan, Czech Republic. And again number one in science is Singapore. Of course, this is the land of caning, which I do not know if there is any correlation between one and the other, but it seems with respect to academic performance caning may work.

I do want to, in all seriousness, though, talk about what Secretary Riley, the Secretary of Education, had said when he observed this report. Very similar to what our President had mentioned as well. He says the content of U.S. 8th grade mathematics classes is not as challenging as that of other countries and topic coverage is not as focused.

He also observed one explanation for our poor performance internationally may be that most U.S. mathematics teachers report familiarity with reform recommendations, although only a few apply the key points in their classrooms.

And the final point the Secretary mentioned, and again I quote from his observations on this report, evidence suggests that the United States teachers do not receive as much practical training and daily support as their colleagues in Japan and Germany and other countries as well.

I tend to agree, frankly, with the gentlewoman from Kentucky in her observation that if we want to be serious about improving these numbers, the last place we want to look is to Washington, DC and to our Government here in Washington to try to do something about these numbers.

We should do something in support of our States, and that is focus on the freedom to teach and the liberty to learn. I have to tell my colleagues that when my State board of education members came to visit me just a few weeks ago and came to my office, their No. 1 plea to me as a Member of Congress was for the Federal Government to leave Colorado alone, to let Colorado educate their children on their own terms, to let Colorado begin to design programs that try to turn these numbers around.

We have this picture up here that the gentleman showed earlier. If one wants to see what happens when the Federal Government takes over an educational system, look right there. Because in only one spot in this country does the Federal Government have direct and constitutional authority to manage the education system in a community, and it is Washington, DC, which I would submit and challenge anyone to defy the real result that this is one of the worst places in the country when it comes to educating children.

Children are trapped in this city, Washington, DC, in an educational system that treats every child as though they are identically the same. This is the city that many of us, if we read the newspapers just a couple weeks ago, we saw the headline stories of the teacher who put nine 4th grade children in a room off to the side of a classroom where these children, unobserved and uncontrolled by the teacher, forgotten there for all intents and purposes for over a half-hour, began playing some kind of game where they disrobed and began to have sex. These are 4th grade children.

I would again suggest that if we want to see this activity taking place

throughout the country, just put the Federal Government in control of school districts. But the advice I get from the people who really care about children, who really know what works, they say that the Federal Government needs to play less and less of a role in how we manage our local schools. We need to focus on the freedom to teach and the liberty to learn, and treating teachers like professionals and parents like customers, and that is how we will turn these appalling numbers around and improve these statistics internationally.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will show the other poster, please. We know we have about 760 educational programs spread over 39 agencies in Washington that spend over \$100 billion a year on education. Yet the gentleman has just read out some statistics in math and science and reading that frankly scare me to death.

Now, does my colleague agree with the President that we cannot ask the American people to spend more money on education?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. NORWOOD. The question is, does the gentleman agree with the President when he says since we do spend \$120 billion a year over 760 programs, over 39 different agencies of Government, does the gentleman agree with the President that we cannot ask the American people to spend more money on education, in view of the numbers and statistics that the gentleman just read a few minutes ago?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I would agree wholeheartedly. In fact, the other portion of that report has another graph showing that the amount of money we spend in the United States has no bearing whatsoever on our ability to teach better; that, in fact, the more and more we spend, the worse we seem to do when compared to national standards.

Here is the quote from the report. We spend, on average, about \$6,500 per pupil. That is nationally. Only one country spends more than we do, and that is Switzerland. Yet these countries that outperform us, Hungary, the Czech Republic, South Korea, Japan, England, France, Denmark, Germany, and so on, all spend fewer dollars per pupil than we do here in the United States, yet we rank so poorly in comparison with those countries.

Mr. NORWOOD. Well, how should we rank before we start saying that the American people should spend more money on education? Should we come in second in math before we do the rest of what the President says?

We are not going to ask the American people to spend more money on education until we do better with the money we are spending now. So should we be second in math or third in math around the globe? Where should the cutoff point be?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, I do not think anybody in

this Chamber will be satisfied until we score No. 1. The evidence our colleague from Colorado has pointed out shows the issue is not money. We are spending more than most people around the globe and we are getting mediocre, unacceptable results.

So the answer is not to pour more money into the system, but it is taking a look at where the money is going and taking a look at the system and how we make the system more effective.

I want to yield to my other colleague from Georgia, and I appreciate his being here. This is wonderful tonight.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. First of all I want to join with my colleague from Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, in his compliments to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, for holding the hearing in Georgia. We do regret the gentleman was unable to be there with us, but we appreciate his scheduling this Special Order.

I want to share with my colleagues some of the comments, as my colleague from Georgia began doing a few minutes ago, as we listen to people at every level of the delivery system in our State.

Even though we have a lot of progress to be made in Georgia, there are many things we are indeed proud of. One is we have a HOPE scholarship program. And unlike the fact that the President is borrowing and adopting the name of it for his proposal, the uniqueness of ours is that we have a funding source that is separate and distinct from the taxpayers' normal revenue stream. The lottery proceeds from our State fund it and it is a very successful program. Would it not be nice if there could be an alternative funding source to fund the President's proposal?

I want to say to the gentleman that both my parents were public school teachers. They were classroom teachers. My wife is presently a 6th grade middle school teacher in our home county. So I have a genetic as well as a spousal bias toward where I think education dollars should flow, and that is to the classroom.

There are three things that stood out in my mind as to what we heard last week. The first is that our schools are faced with greater social problems than they have ever been faced with before, and in order to overcome those social problems we need greater parental support as well as parental participation.

The second thing was that discipline is a major problem in our school system, and all of us want to do what will help rather than what will hurt. As the gentleman knows, we are considering in the reauthorization of the IDEA program the issue of removing some of the Federal impediments to discipline that have put mandates and restraints that interfere with teachers and administrators in terms of discipline.

Third is the flexibility in the use of Federal funds, the ability to design programs that meet local needs rather than having to meet a Federal mandate.

□ 1815

Let me share just a few quotes with the gentleman of people who have made some observations about it. One was from Dr. Craig Dowling, a principal of an elementary school down in Valdosta, GA, when he said, "Federal programs come with guidelines and strings that choke school improvement. Guidelines for a program such as Title I may help a school in Atlanta or Washington, DC, and totally disturb a school in south Georgia or the central plains."

In terms of flexibility, I think the chairman of our State school board said it best, Mr. Johnny Isakson. He said this: "There are far too many dollars scattered in far too many programs managed by far too many agencies."

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Does the gentleman mean 39 agencies dealing with education is too many in Washington?

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I am afraid so. Mr. Isakson is a businessman and he looks at it from that point of view. He said, if the dollars spent could be concentrated, there would be less disturbance and that more of the money would actually flow into education and out of administration.

Let me give a classic example that we heard from, from a lady who was a director of an adult literacy services center in Dublin, GA. She said this, speaking of the grant process. In other words, when applying for a Federal grant for education, this is what she observed: "The process is cumbersome and labor intensive. Writing the 1997 proposal consumed nearly two months of the literacy director's time. Measuring accountability in terms of performance rather than volume of paperwork is the best solution to the problem."

We heard some very common sense, practical observations from people who have hands-on daily experience in delivering education to children in the classroom.

Once again, I thank the gentleman for affording us this opportunity, and I thank the gentleman for allowing me to share these comments today.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague from Georgia. I do express my regrets that I was unable to be at the hearing. I think the gentleman has got some wonderful testimony. I find it interesting. It has been one of the most exciting projects I have worked on because we have been able to go around the country. We have been in California, we have been in Arizona, we were in Georgia, we are going to New York, we have done some things in Michigan, Milwaukee, Chicago, and we are learning about what is working on education. From what my colleague has told me, I did not catch the full impact, there are some that are blasting or taking some pot shots at a discovery process, finding out what is working when we obviously know that what we are doing today is not working, but there are some that are taking a real critical look at that.

Mr. NORWOOD. If the gentleman will yield, if we do not stop doing that, if we do not stop politicizing this issue, we are never going to get to the point where we can resolve the problem. I would point out that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL] mentioned a constituent of mine in Dublin, GA. She is from my district and I was very proud of her for her commentary, but I also want to remind the gentleman that Dr. Dowling from Valdosta, GA, yes, he is a principal of a school but he is also a father of five or six children, and one of his quotes that has stuck with me since the day we were down there is that he said, and I quote, "I firmly believe that school improvement can only be achieved in the classroom."

I think many of us come to this discovery process with that bias. It is true. I believe that we ought to send back the responsibility for education, not just the classroom but the parents and the teachers. I will conclude to go to another meeting, Mr. Speaker, but one of the very fine things that was said in our hearing was said by Mr. Kelly McCutchen, executive director of the Georgia Public Policy Foundation. I think he almost sums the whole thing up in this quote: "Education in America is the constitutional responsibility of the States, the social responsibility of communities, and the moral responsibility of families and except when the civil rights of individuals are menaced, the Federal Government should never impede the capacity of families, communities and States to decide how best to provide education for their children."

I do not know of a better statement that sums up exactly how I feel about it.

QUOTATIONS FOR SPECIAL ORDERS, APRIL 30
FROM GEORGIA CROSSROADS HEARING
QUOTATIONS

Dr. Linda Shrenko, State Superintendent: "The most frequent message I have heard is that no one can make better decisions about local education than the parents, teachers, and students in those local communities."

Dr. Linda Shrenko, State Superintendent: "Administrators from Washington will never meet the needs of individual children * * * I cast my vote for returning as many dollars directly to local schools as we are able. * * *"

Mr. Kelly McCutchen, Executive Director, Georgia Public Policy Foundation: (quoting Chester Finn) "Education in America is the 'constitutional responsibility of the states, the social responsibility of communities, and the moral responsibility of families' and 'except when the civil rights of individuals are menaced * * * [the federal government should] never impede the capacity of families, communities and states to decide how best to provide education to their children.'"

Dr. Craig Dowling, Principal, West Gordon Elementary School, Valdosta, GA: "I firmly believe that school improvement can only be achieved in the classroom."

Dr. Craig Dowling, Principal, West Gordon Elementary School, Valdosta, GA: "[Federal programs] come with guidelines and strings that choke school improvement * * * Guidelines for a program such as Title I may help a school in Atlanta or Washington, D.C., and

totally disturb a school in south Georgia or the central plains."

Dr. Craig Dowling, Principal, West Gordon Elementary School, Valdosta, GA: "Welfare sets up a downward spiral of hopelessness and despair where children rarely see an adult working * * * social issues can not be resolved through our schools."

Dr. Laura Frederick, Assistant Professor, Georgia State University: "What's wasted in schools is time, money, and a great deal of student potential when we adopt unproven instructional programs because they should be good, because the publisher is offering free supplementary materials with the purchase of the programs, or because the sales representatives are wining and dining the textbook selection committee."

Mr. Johnny Isakson, Chairman, State Board of Education: "There are far too many dollars scattered in far too many programs managed by far too many agencies. If the dollars spent could be concentrated, the management less disbursed, then more of the money would actually flow into education and out of administration."

Mr. Johnny Isakson, Chairman of the State Board of Education: (speaking about Mr. Clinton's suggestion of increased federal funding of school construction) "While this is a laudable recommendation, it really should be the responsibility of local boards of education and their taxpayers to fund and pay for the school facilities improvements they want . . . On March 17th, 63 Georgia public school systems ratified local option sales taxes which, over the next five years, will raise \$3.5 billion for school construction."

Ms. Dahlia Wren, Director, Adult Literacy Services, Heart of Georgia Technical Institute, Dublin, GA: (speaking of the federal grant process) "The process is cumbersome and labor intensive. . . . Writing the [1997] proposal consumed nearly two months of the literacy director's time . . . measuring accountability in terms of performance rather than volume of paperwork is the best solution to the problem."

ANECDOTES

Dr. Linda Schrenko, Georgia State Superintendent of Schools: Dr. Shrenko reported that Georgia taxpayers send 35 billion dollars to Washington. They receive back 454 million dollars for education. This is less than a 1.3% return on their tax dollar for education.

Mr. John Roddy, Director of Federal Programs for Georgia: Mr. Roddy reported a conversation he had with a researcher who had done a study evaluating the effectiveness of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools federal program. According to Mr. Roddy, the researcher reported that children who had not received the Safe and Drug-Free Schools training actually had a lower incidence of drug use than the children who did receive the training.

Dr. Elizabeth Lyons, Principal, C.W. Hill Elementary School, Atlanta, GA: Dr. Lyons described a reading program, "Readaerobics," that she and her staff developed in response to their students' poor achievements in reading. The program is conducted on Saturday mornings to teach basic phonics skills in a fun way. Parents are required to donate one Saturday morning each month in order for their children to participate, so parental involvement is mandatory. J.C. Penney's has taken note of the program and is offering its financial support to the Readaerobics program.

Mr. Buster Evans, Superintendent, Bleckley County School District, Cochran, GA: Mr. Evans told of a school system that turned around its students' poor reading achievements with the implementation of two complimentary reading programs.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the vice chairman of the subcommittee for participating and sharing those comments with me and chairing the hearing in Georgia last week.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. I thank my friend from Michigan for addressing what in my view is a critical subject to many of us in this body. One of our Founding Fathers, James Madison, once said that knowledge shall forever govern ignorance. I do not think there are many of us who are more concerned or there is any subject that is more of a priority for many of the Members of this body than coming up with a system that provides the absolute highest quality education at the least possible cost. I commend my friend for the great work that he has done in drawing attention to this important issue all over our country.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I am not sure that we are even talking about the lowest possible cost. I think everybody here is willing to take a look. If we were getting exemplary results, we would not go through a cost reduction effort, and that is not the focus here, is saving a penny. The problem that we are facing today is the results that our kids are getting is not good enough and that is the number one priority.

Mr. THUNE. The gentleman is exactly right. I think that is the thing that sometimes gets lost in all this discussion because it becomes a discussion about dollars and cents. Ultimately I think what we are talking about here is quality. Are we getting results? Are we getting the best possible bang for the dollars that we are investing?

I would submit that in my State of South Dakota, and I grew up in a small town, went to a small school, and am the product of the investment, the energies that a lot of people, teachers and administrators poured into me that were very dedicated and very committed, and I would look to our State and my two little girls, who are 10 and 7, who were attending a public school system in South Dakota as well. We are getting a wonderful education there. We now have them in a public school system out here.

I have a very personal concern in this issue and where we are going with it. I would say that if we look at the statistics around the country and the dollars that are put into per pupil cost in different States and the performance that we get, and my State of South Dakota I think is a good example because we rank 45th in the amount of per pupil spending and yet on SAT performance we rank seventh in the country. There are a number of other states, Utah again is a good case in point, the numbers that I have in front of me, which is 50th in terms of total cost and yet ranks second in SAT performance. I think when we talk about this issue, we cannot talk about it in terms of

necessarily an equation between more money and better quality. That clearly is the case.

What I would suggest is that I have observed the education of my two little girls, that there is no better laboratory I think to instill knowledge and to instill values in our kids today, but one of the things, missing ingredients is that we have along the way, I think, tried to become so conscious of the governmental involvement that the parents have stepped out of the equation in many cases, and we do need in my judgement to put more controls in the hands of parents, school boards, administrators and teachers, and we will get a better quality product if we are willing to do that.

As I was growing up in a small school system, I on occasion, my third grade teacher daily used to read to us Laura Ingalls Wilder books, I do not know whether the gentleman is familiar with her or not but she is someone who grew up on the prairies of the Midwest and spent much of her growing-up years in South Dakota. My 9-year-old, 10-year-old now, is currently reading those same books. One evening as she was reading it I mentioned to her, "Brittany, did you know that Laura Ingalls Wilder spent a great deal of her growing up time right in the State of South Dakota, in your home State?"

She said, "I know, Dad, she was a conservative, committed to smaller government and a better future."

I thought, they are also very impressionable. It is clear to me she had listened to some of the speeches I had made along the way. The point being that when Laurel Ingalls Wilder was growing up, it was a time at which we had a pioneer spirit, we were an independent self-sufficient people and we did not look to big government for solutions to a lot of our problems.

I think at the heart of this debate and this issue is the fact that we need to focus that attention back on what we can do to put that power, that control, that authority, that decision-making in the hands of people at the local level. If in fact we will shift that model in that direction, we will get the kind of results and the quality and the performance that I think the gentleman has talked about and have drawn attention to throughout this country.

I thank the gentleman for his good work and look forward to being a part of this dialogue in what we can do to make ours the model and really the example around the world of the highest quality education that we can possibly have.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the gentleman for his comments. We really are going through a process where we are identifying what is working. We actually have developed what we call lessons in education. Some of the lessons we have learned as we have had hearings around the country are: Parents care the most about their children's education. They actually know the

name of the teacher like the student does versus the bureaucrat that may be here in Washington.

Good intentions do not equal good policy. We have seen that in Washington. Every time there appears to be a problem, we create a new program. The end result is 760 programs, 39 agencies.

More does not always equal better. More money through the same failed system is not going to improve results.

Education must be child-centered.

Lesson number 5. When we spend more, we create more tax burden. Somebody has to come up with the dollars. It is our responsibility to make sure that we are getting the kind of results that we need.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to move to my colleague from North Carolina. I cannot imagine what he wants to talk about, but he has been sitting there so patiently. I believe he may want to talk about one of the President's proposals.

Mr. BALLENGER. The gentleman and I attended a hearing in Oklahoma. What I wanted to bring up, and we have discussed it here in one way or another, but the idea of spending money wisely. I am here to express a concern which our Democrat friends mentioned earlier on the condition of the public schools today.

A recent "Prime Time Live" segment by Diane Sawyer documented the deteriorating buildings and inadequate structures used to house our children. To combat this appalling situation, President Clinton has proposed a \$5 billion mandatory appropriation to guarantee the interest payments for the construction and renovation of elementary and secondary schools.

That sounds like motherhood, apple pie, and the greatest thing since sliced bread. But one of the problems that the gentleman and I both know is that once the first dollar of Federal money is accepted, then there is a little thing called the Davis-Bacon law that goes into effect. What is the Davis-Bacon law? What it does is it mandates that you pay higher wages for construction.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. My colleague from Kentucky may want to jump in. The gentleman may want to just explain the hearing that we went to in Oklahoma.

Mr. BALLENGER. Strangely enough, we had heard that there were strange things going on in Oklahoma. Luckily for us, the Secretary of Labor out there had investigated the actual operation of the Davis-Bacon law as far as Oklahoma was concerned.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. What does Davis-Bacon do? Maybe our colleague from Kentucky can explain exactly what Davis-Bacon does because it is important that people understand this concept. Then we can go back into what we found about paving machines doing concrete and all of these kinds of things.

Mrs. NORTHUP. It is important, and it is important because I think the American people would be interested in how their tax dollars are spent.

What the Federal Government says is that any school that is built with a dollar of Federal money, that certain provisions in the bidding process have to take place. One of those provisions is that extraordinarily high wages have to be paid, higher wages than most of the taxpayers will ever earn. What this does is push up the cost of construction 11 to 20 percent.

This makes no sense. We are talking about the desperate need to build more schools. What you do is you give the schools the opportunity to help offset some of their interest payments, but by doing that, they incur 11 to 20 percent higher costs in building every single school.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. My colleague from North Carolina can explain exactly how this happens. The process is we try here in Washington, some people, the gentleman and I have been to the building, I am not sure I can find it on here, but I think it is somewhere in this neighborhood over here. There is a person in a building over here, and a group of about 60, 80 people that are trying to determine pay rates for 40, 50 job categories in every county in America.

What did we find in Oklahoma?

Mr. BALLENGER. For instance, a wage survey submitted to the Department of Labor, this is in Oklahoma, showed a \$20 million renovation occurred at the University of Oklahoma football stadium involving 28 workers. In reality no work was done on the football stadium. Twenty million dollars sent in in the report to say they had done this work and it never happened.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The report was sent in, so on the report they outlined the wage scales that are paid or were paid to these workers on this project and for any Federal project or any project that had Federal dollars on it, these were going to be the wages that were going to be paid.

So this was bogus information coming into Washington from the State of Oklahoma, and for any project now being constructed in Oklahoma that is the wage rate that was going to have to be paid. They tried to do the same thing in Kentucky.

Mr. BALLENGER. Let me give another one. The case showed that 7 asphalt machines, extremely large machines, as big as trucks, were used to pave a parking lot for an Internal Revenue Service building in Oklahoma. Workers supposedly were paid \$15 an hour. In reality, the parking lot had only room for 30 cars and it was made of concrete. There was no way that you could use asphalt paving on it. The Department of Labor said that the wages instead of being \$15 an hour should have been \$8 an hour if it had occurred. But it did not happen.

□ 1830

Mr. HOEKSTRA. So with the process the gentleman from North Carolina has outlined, fraudulent data coming in is

what can lead to excessive costs for further Federal projects.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Actually there are two problems here. One is the fraudulent data. When you have a building in Washington, DC that is trying to determine construction projects and costs in Oklahoma, what you are doing is removing the two so far apart that you make fraud a very easy, very easily an occurrence. But furthermore, even if you have no fraud, what you have are extraordinarily high wage rates in places like Kentucky, places where if you were an individual, if you were a taxpayer, if you were going to construct something, you would never pay those construction wages. You would never pay those same level of construction wages.

I might say that in Kentucky, when I looked over those wage scales, there were \$28 an hour, \$26 an hour. We are a poor State. You know, we have people that are working for minimum wage, that are working as hairdressers, that are working in gas stations, that are driving school buses, that are working on the assembly line at Ford Motor Co. None of those people make \$28 an hour. And for them to pay their taxes and have their taxes pay people to build schools for their children at extraordinarily high wage rates is an absolute abuse of their tax dollars.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The gentleman from North Carolina will explain why that will happen with the school construction now.

I thought we were helping the schools to get more bang for their buck.

Mr. BALLENGER. Well, the truth of the matter is you know as well as I do that if you add this additional labor cost—I mean suppose the President is going to guarantee your interest rate on your bonds that you have. North Carolina sold a billion, \$200 million worth of bonds. My own county sold \$50 million worth of bonds. Thank goodness I think they are in such financial shape that they will not be desiring of using this thing, but if they were, and those bonds cost 6 percent, and the labor costs were 10 percent higher, you have lost 4 percent because you use Federal assistance.

It is unbelievable.

Mrs. NORTHUP. I want to just remind you though that even though North Carolina may not incur the higher school costs and may not borrow out of this \$5 billion, this \$5 billion represents the tax dollars they have paid to Washington, and they are just going to lose it for some State that does not have the foresight to be able to afford this.

Mr. BALLENGER. If I might, I would like to quote from the Wall Street Journal one statement here. An inspector general's report has blown this whistle on the Davis-Bacon Act, and that 1931 law by which the Labor Department drives up the cost of federally subsidized construction by requiring what are in effect union wages. A

Federal audit of 800 wage survey forms used to calculate the local prevailing or union wage found that nearly two out of three forms contained significant errors and that deliberate misreporting activity may exist.

It is an ideal situation for fraud and abuse, and there is an indictment out in Oklahoma for one of the fellows that our hearing brought to the light of the law enforcement.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If any of my colleagues could maybe answer the question. I mean if Washington does not set the wages for these projects, how would we actually find out the wages?

Mrs. NORTHUP. The best way to build a school for our children is for each school district to do it as they do it right now. They say, what do we need? We need this many classrooms, we need these certain specifications, and they put it out for an open bid process, and then all the companies that build can bid on those bid processes, and the taxpayers know they get the best price for the school they are going to build. That is what they deserve for the sacrifice they pay in their taxes, and that is the best way, close to home, to make sure that each school is built in accordance to specifications and at the cheapest price.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is kind of interesting what the woman has outlined. It is that would make the people in this building feel very uncomfortable because they do not believe that competitive bidding actually works in the construction industry. Even though we build huge buildings, construction projects, and we use it every day, for some reason the Federal Government does not believe that competitive bidding would work for us.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to challenge the Department of Education and the President to rethink their proposal. Since they believe that schools construction is so important, since they believe the need is so great that we cannot afford it, I am going to ask them to resubmit their proposal and take out the Davis-Bacon provision, say that they will be excepted from this so that those projects that they say we need so badly will be built, there will be an opportunity for more schools for our children, and they can prove how dedicated they are to our kids by removing this very costly provision.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If we put in the prevailing wage provision without the people here in Washington determining the wages, we will lose, I say to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], anywhere from 10 to 20 percent, maybe more of the purchasing power. So this \$5 billion, and it is going—I mean we will lose more than that because this is just a partial contribution to these projects, but the whole project will then be subject to Davis or to the prevailing wage law.

My colleague from Colorado.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. That is the perfect point that I think

the American people need to understand in this particular proposal because what the \$5 billion that the Clinton administration wants us to believe is going to go toward school construction is only a fraction of the total cost of the project.

What I mean by that is that \$5 billion is targeted toward buying down the interest that a school district would incur in financing a construction project. But even though a tiny fraction of the dollars that would be available to those school districts seems small, the fact that it is Federal funds and has a Davis-Bacon Act attached to them, when those funds are commingled with the State or local dollars that are involved in a project, it really spoils the buying power of all of the dollars that should be going toward bricks and mortar to build viable schools and schools that promote learning for our children.

But instead what the Clinton administration design is, is to have a greater portion, the 11, 20, 30 percent I have heard in many cases depending on what area of the country; to have that percentage of the dollars go away from construction, away from children, and toward some other purpose.

Now that other purpose may be useful to some people, but it is not useful to children. It is not useful to our goals to try to educate children, and this is the real conflict and vision, I think, between our Republican vision for schooling and the Democrat vision of schooling where we really want to get those dollars to kids. We really want to put them toward learning, not toward some union satisfaction that is a payback on a political promise.

Mr. BALLENGER. The saddest thing of all is the only people that will have to use this are the poorest school districts in the country. In other words, they do not have the taxing power to back up the bond issues they could sell, so they are going to have to use this 5 percent underwriting of their interest to sell the bonds which means the poorest people in the country will get the worst deal on building schools.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The poorest districts in the country will end up paying a premium for all of their construction costs and will actually end up, may end up, getting less bang for their dollar than if they had never gotten involved with the Federal Government in the first place. But sometimes the stuff looks just so enticing, and it makes great rhetoric.

I think the gentleman from Colorado is absolutely right. We are not talking about the quality of education. We are talking about designing the best system of getting the financial resources to the child and to the classroom and the school construction program, and as with many of the other programs, one of our colleagues pointed out earlier, some of these programs take 21 weeks, not some, most of them on the average take 21 weeks, 216 steps, and even then you get an inflated price.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to realize that there will be a lot of rhetoric about this. I know that I have heard the debate that what you get is more efficiency when you use higher-price labor, but the true effect is if you got more efficiency, those companies that used the \$28-an-hour workers would be able to bid on the job and get it without prevailing wage. If you actually save money by using higher price labor, then you could come in with lower bids, you would win the bid contract. So I think that you are going to hear some misinformation.

The other question is that if you do not set those wages high, that you are going to take advantage of people who are very poor. The truth is the people who are very poor, the people who have modest incomes, middle-income America, are going to subsidize with their tax dollars extraordinarily high pay rates for those people that work on the schools. It is not the workers who are talking advantage of on the schools, but all the other workers in our States and across this country that are going to pay higher taxes in order to get school projects they could get at a cheaper price.

Mr. BALLENGER. Suppose all the money they could save went into buying computers. This is capital outlay, the same deal. In other words, the money that they have to spend on higher construction costs could go into computers, all kinds of equipment that would make the school a better place.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. This is all about using the taxpayers' dollars more effectively.

Mr. BALLENGER. Right.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. My colleague from Colorado.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I wanted to just give you one more example on this Davis-Bacon Act and what the impact is on public projects and construction projects.

I returned from a couple weeks in, over the Easter break, doing town meetings throughout eastern Colorado; I went to a town called Trinidad which is in the southern part of Colorado, and the mayor, a Democrat I might add, came to me, and he talked about the Davis-Bacon Act as the No. 1 problem they are facing in Trinidad, CO. And they want to repair their library there, repair the library, not replace it, just repair it. In the process of repairing their town library they accepted \$17,500 of Federal funds that they received in a rural redevelopment and construction grant, which was a small portion of the overall costs of this repair project. They concluded that by the time they calculated the cost of accepting \$17,000 of Federal funds, costs attributable directly to the Davis-Bacon Act, that they would have been better off to replace the entire building than to make the small repairs that they had in mind.

Now I ask you to think about that when President Clinton and the Demo-

crats come here and talk about this \$5 billion as though it somehow is going to help our children and help our schools, and I assure you it will not. Before we came here tonight, one of our friends on the other side of the aisle, Democrat side of the aisle, said would it not be trying to paint a bleak picture for our children, said would it not be a shame if the children and the teachers returned this fall to crumbling schools.

Let me ask a more direct question: Would it not be a shame if those children and teachers returned in the fall to crumbling schools that are still crumbling, even after spending \$5 billion of Federal funds? Our States, as a matter of fact, are better off unencumbered by Federal intrusion in the efforts of trying to repair schools and taking care of children. That is where our confidence ought to be placed, not here in Washington.

Mr. BALLENGER. We thank the kind gentleman. I would like to congratulate you on first of all your hearings throughout the country, but second of all, bringing this to, I hope, our TV audience to let them better understand what this is all about.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleagues for participating tonight. We are going to continue this dialogue on education. It is a very important one. We are going to continue hearings. This President in many cases has the same vision of quality education for our children, the best educated kids in the world. We share that vision. I think where we separate and go down different paths is he believes the answer perhaps too often lies here in Washington where we believe the answer lies with parents, with teachers and a local classroom.

I thank my colleagues for being here tonight.

BIPARTISAN COOPERATION IN THE AREA OF EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to applaud the fact that we have been discussing education now for more than 2 hours and that both parties have chosen to talk about education tonight. It is an indication of the kind of priority that we have set here in Washington on education, both parties.

As I said earlier this afternoon, we are in a situation now where something wonderful is going to happen in the 105th Congress as a result of the bipartisan cooperation, which I think is very sincere and very real. We have a problem, however, that there are people holding on to the past, the recent past, the past of the 104th Congress. They really understand that there is a new environment for the discussion of

education issues as a new political environment, and they discovered that political environment last year during the 104th Congress.

The Contract With America made an onslaught on Federal participation in education. The Contract With America came forward and proposed to eliminate, eradicate, the Department of Education. They proposed to cut school lunches, they proposed to cut Head Start, they proposed to cut Title I.

I do not want to dwell too much on that unfortunate, very uncomfortable situation of the 104th Congress, but it is important to set all discussion within the context of the great triumph accomplished by the common sense of the American people. The common sense of the voters triumphed over all of the proposals of the Republican majority for education, the proposals that would have rolled us backwards. They even proposed a total of cuts that would have amounted to about \$4 billion at the beginning of the 104th Congress. The Republican majority made those proposals and moved that way; it shut down the government. Let us not forget that the government was shut down because the President and the White House refused to go along with drastic extreme proposals for cuts in areas like education.

□ 1845

Let me just conclude this recapitulation of the 104th Congress by saying that I want to pay tribute to and give credit to those leaders in the Republican majority who decided to turn it all around. They did a 360 degree turn. They listened to the common sense being expressed by the American people. They listened to the voters. They listened.

They watched the polls which showed that the American voters ranked education as a high priority, and they have consistently been doing so for some time. They listened and at the last minute, faced with the possibility that their negative positions on education might very much impact on their reelection possibilities, they did a 360 degree turnaround. I applaud the fact that they were not so ideologically entrenched, so philosophically dogmatic that they could not make the turn. Given the necessity of getting re-elected, they decided to make the turn.

I applaud the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, who is a former school principal, teacher, school superintendent, been around a long time, been on the Committee on Education and the Workforce for a long time, he was there with his insight, his experience, his wisdom. So when the turnaround took place, the chairman can tell them where to intelligently make the changes.

The turnaround, which was a 360 degree turnaround, instead of cutting education by \$4 billion, they increased