

Overall, more than 3,000 community water systems in the United States would have to come into compliance, and the rule would have more than tripled water rates in many small communities.

Now, this Member believes that communities will be willing to spend the money necessary to address this matter if they were convinced that they would see actual health benefits by making the changes.

According to an April 14, 2001 article in the New York Times, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Mayor Jim Baca, a Democrat stated, "What we would like is some definitive scientific evidence that this would be worth doing. I am a pretty strong environmentalist but I was convinced that the data did not justify the new level."

It is important to listen to utility superintendents, city administrators, village boards, mayors and other local and State officials, including public health officials, who are concerned about the effect the proposed rule and its associated costs would have on their communities. These are people who have a powerful incentive to provide safe drinking water, since they and their constituents will be drinking that water. These community leaders know where the buck stops. They certainly would not subject themselves and their families and friends to harmful water. Quite simply, these local officials have not been convinced of the need to lower the arsenic to the level proposed by the Clinton administration.

It is also helpful to note that any community in the country now has the authority to lower arsenic in its drinking water to whatever level it chooses below 50 parts per billion. The reason communities have not lowered their levels to 10 parts per billion is that the health benefits have not been shown to justify the enormous cost.

The American Water Works Association stated in its comment last year, "At the level of 10 ppb or lower, the health risk reduction benefits become vanishingly small as compared to the costs."

The costs, however, are real. The American Water Works Association, which supports a reduction in the current arsenic standard, has estimated the proposed rule would cost \$600 million annually and require \$5 billion in capital outlays. In an ideal world, with unlimited resources, it may make sense to propose changes in the hope that they may provide a benefit. However, the reality is that communities do not have unlimited funds.

Everyone deserves safe drinking water and this Member urges his colleagues to listen to State and local officials on how to provide it.

THE NECESSITY OF THE HOUSE TO BALANCE ITS PRIORITIES AND MOVE FORWARD

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

uary 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning I wish to address the necessity for this House to balance its priorities and to begin to move forward its legislative agenda. Before I do that, let me associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) and thank him for bringing to the floor and dropping today legislation that will allow the printing of a book honoring Asian Pacific Islander Americans in Congress, particularly as we celebrate the history of our Asian American friends. This is a diverse country and we reflect the wonderfulness of that diversity.

As we do that as well, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am disturbed and concerned. Today we will rush to judgment, having missed two pages of the budget last week and having to delay it until Tuesday, to support a budget resolution that includes an enormous tax cut but fails to include \$294 billion for what we have all come to know as a very important issue, and that is the education of our children. With this budget, we know that we will be invading the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds by the year 2011.

I would have hoped that we would have been more timely with this budget, giving us more time to debate it and focusing on issues like making sure that uninsured children and uninsured Americans have health care, providing prescription drug coverage the way it should be, and including the \$294 billion for our educational needs, collaborating with our local governments and local school boards.

Tragically, another violent act at school occurred in an Alaska elementary school. This is Children's Mental Health Month and I am delighted to be able to focus on the need for mental health services for all of Americans, but as well to focus on the needs of our children. I would like to see more in-school health clinics for our children to be able to access services for both their physical health needs, immunizations, but as well, their mental health needs.

I believe that as we move forward to address the question of our foreign authorization bill, we will need to seriously debate the question of the loss of the United States' seat on the Human Rights Council in the United Nations. Many of my colleagues will rise in distress and anger, saying that we should no longer be associated with the United Nations. We should be cautious, and certainly we should be understanding of the fact that the United Nations now stands as the only entity where so many countries of so many diverse and disparate viewpoints actually can talk to each other.

Even though it is a very disturbing act to have lost the seat, we too have to look at the policy of the United States as it relates to the nonpayment

of its dues and its actions over the last couple of months that suggest that its world associates are unhappy, but we must not step away from fighting for human rights and we must insist that human rights becomes the call of the day for all nations, including China and Sudan and many others.

I want to thank and congratulate Senator Ellis and Representative Thompson of the State of Texas for getting through the Senate and the House a hate crimes legislative initiative, and I raise that point because it is long overdue for the United States of America's Congress to pass real hate crimes legislation to say and make a statement to those who would do heinous acts on the basis of someone's difference that we will not tolerate that in America. It still goes on in Texas. It still goes on in States across this Nation, and I think that we are long overdue for getting hate crime legislation to the floor.

We do understand that there has been movement in the Cincinnati occurrences, the tragedy of having had 15 African American males shot by the police since 1995. I think it is important that the Attorney General has now indicated that there will be a civil rights investigation, do it expeditiously and quickly, and begin to heal and solve those problems by insisting that the police department and the community work closely together.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker, there are several enormously important issues that we are dealing with as it relates to the energy crisis. We are not doing enough in this Congress. We are not doing enough in the administration by simply saying, handle it yourself; it is not going to go away. I believe it is time to help Americans with gasoline prices. I believe it is time to be able to provide dollars for those who will be overheated in the summer. With more additional funding for LIHEAP dollars in the State of Texas in 1998 and 1999, we lost 130-plus citizens because of the heat and not being able to provide the dollars they needed for utility costs or even having air-conditioners. I think certainly we should be helping with the brownouts. Conservation is important. Exploration is important within reason, but we must have emergency relief now for those who are experiencing the energy crisis, because it is here.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can focus on a lot of priorities and we are not doing so. Even as we watch the various layoffs of individuals across this Nation, they are asking for the Congress to act. Do not look at the layoffs and ignore them and say it is not in my State, just like we should not look at the energy crisis and ignore it and say it is not in my State. I believe we have priorities. We should act on them.

WHERE DOES THE EDUCATION MONEY GO?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, many say as California goes, so goes the rest of the Nation. Considering that, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a new study of public education spending in California.

The study reveals that the generally accepted per-pupil spending figure of \$6,700 for California students significantly understates the actual per-pupil spending figure that is approximately \$8,500. Moreover, two out of five, two out of every five, public school dollars are spent on bureaucracy and overhead rather than on classrooms. Instructions and internal legal squabbles drain education dollars from the system.

The authors, Dr. Bonsteel of San Francisco and accountant Carl Brodt of Berkeley, intended their analysis to be a nonpartisan one.

□ 1300

Bonsteel is a Democrat and Brodt is a Republican.

I will share some of the key findings of the study entitled, "Where is all the money going? Bureaucrats and Overhead in California's Public Schools," together with the authors' proposal for decreasing bureaucracy and enhancing accountability.

First, consider that inflation-adjusted spending on public education in California has increased by 39 percent since 1978. Nevertheless, textbooks are frequently unavailable, school libraries have been shut down, and art and music programs have been terminated. The authors conclude, "This is primarily because of the explosion in spending on administration and overhead."

Approximately 40 percent of California's K-12 tax dollars are spent on bureaucracy and overhead, not classroom instruction. This figure comes not just from the Bonsteel-Brodt analysis, but also from previous studies conducted by the Rand Corporation and the Little Hoover Commission.

Four levels of administration run K-12 schools in California, and they act as though they are separate fiefdoms. They quarrel frequently, and often those disagreements end in lawsuits among the bureaucratic fiefdoms, with the taxpayers picking up the tab for lawyers on both sides. The California Department of Education and the State Department of Education maintain legal counsel to sue each other.

This Bonsteel-Brodt study presents a sample State Board of Education agenda listing 30 lawsuits confronting the State Board. Seven of those suits pit one layer of the education bureaucracy against another layer.

In one set of lawsuits, the San Francisco Unified School District and the State Department of Education have

squared off over bilingual education. The STAR testing statute mandates that children who have been in the United States at least a year be tested in English, the presumption being they should have learned English by then. But the San Francisco school district contends it must test immigrant students in their non-English native language. San Francisco is the only district making that claim, but taxpayers must cover the cost of that legal spat.

Even more troubling is that special education programs for children with mental and physical handicaps are plagued by bureaucratic gridlock at the Federal, State, county, and local levels, as well as by unfunded mandates from the Federal and State levels. Parents of special-ed children have no effective voice in program decision-making.

Local citizens have diminishing power to influence local school policy, since almost two-thirds of education tax dollars now are funneled through the States. In addition, while the Federal Government furnishes just 6 percent of education funding, its requirements account for close to half of all education paperwork. Lisa Keegan, State Superintendent for Arizona schools, has said it takes 165 members of her staff, 45 percent of the total, just to manage Federal programs.

The Bonsteel-Brodt study notes bureaucracies in all levels "invariably understate true per student spending." At the national level, the figures released by the National Center for Education Statistics are usually the "current expenditures" number, which does not account for the cost of school payments or interest payments on school bonds.

In California, the spending statistics are "even more deceptive," the study's authors charge. The all-inclusive and thus more accurate figure for per-pupil spending in California is approximately \$8,500 per student, more than 25 percent higher. Using the low figure, the California NEA affiliate has advocated hefty spending increases for the express purpose of raising the State's per pupil spending above the national average.

The best hope for decreasing bureaucracy and enhancing accountability, the Bonsteel-Brodt report concludes, is school choice of various kinds. They note, for example, that California's public charter schools have easily outperformed traditional public schools, while operating on about 60 percent of the per-student funding of conventional public schools. The charters have accomplished this by cutting the bureaucratic overhead.

Mr. Speaker, as we look to solve America's education problems, we must first honestly ask, where does the money go? Only then can we make the right and often tough choices to reform education.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.)

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Thomas A. Kuhn, Church of the Incarnation, Dayton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Father, we can never thank You enough for the many blessings You have given to us as a people. You gave all of Your children the same rights as people, and at the same time have given us the means to safeguard those rights. Give us the strength to reach out to those who are unable to safeguard their rights.

You have made us a powerful people. May we always be gentle enough to lift up the fallen, and prepared enough to protect the weak and defenseless.

You have blessed us richly. May we always generously share those blessings with Your children who are poor.

You have given us a beautiful land. May we nurture and preserve it so that those who follow us can always see Your goodness.

Much of what has been given to us has been entrusted to the Members of this great House. Give them a world vision so that they may work for the good of all of Your children. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

REVEREND THOMAS A. KUHN

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)