they deal with two remedial reading classes. Total program costs $75,000 to $80,000 to fund, no math program, no reading recovery program. They have had astounding success with remedial reading, do not want to lose this program, program serves grades 1 through 6. Majority emphasis is on 1, 2, and 3, although it continues to grade 6, and they have students in 4, 5, and 6 who still participate in the program. The majority of students graduate after grade 3. Cuts in the program would hurt this system.

Another one currently has 3½ teachers in grades 1 through 6 teaching remedial reading and math, are anticipating loss of 1 full-time teacher. Each teacher there serves 45 to 60 students. If you lose one teacher, 60 students will not be served in remedial reading. Feels that remedial reading is a good program, has had good results.

Here is one from another school district. They get a little over $200,000 in title I funding, have about 7 full-time teachers plus two aides. Figures they would be cut about $40,000. This means a loss of one teacher, probably one aide and one program. Currently have remedial reading and math in extended-day kindergarten and a transition program for first graders. Those who seem to be struggling are placed in classroom with two teachers. Figures the program that would be cut would be the extended-day kindergarten. They currently serve about 200 kids. Said they are not a high-impact district.

And there are other local school districts closer by that are high-impact and would have more adverse effects on those.

Here is another one. They are every dollar they receive from the title I to directly benefit a child. Currently have three full-time teachers who teach remedial reading and math. Besides regular program during the day, they have had an evening program which provides tutoring. The three teachers serve about 500 students, 25 percent of school population. Cuts in the program funds would directly cut one or more of the teachers. Could not absorb the cuts, and they thank our staff for calling. They say they are quite concerned with it.

I have many others here that have answered our questionnaire, and all of them are to the gist that with a couple of exceptions where the school districts are fairly well funded, that they would not be able to replace these programs with local funds, that they would have to do without, and many children would be hurt by these cuts that are being made in education for the title I programs.

Every one of them said that these moneys, our Federal dollars, are being used wisely to help educate, they are being used to make sure our children learn as they progress through the elementary grades. And I think it is poundwise, very foolish for their House to continue on the road to cutting education for our youngsters. They are the future of our country. To say we do not need to educate them, I think is a vast mistake.

Another thing I would like to comment on is some of these school districts are in very economically low-grade or poor areas, and they need this money. They are not going to be able to replace it with local tax dollars.

So I urge the House to restore the funding for our educational programs.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES AND FUNDING OF THE EPA

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address the House this evening and talk about the Vice President's speech today. The Vice President was on a mission to distort what the Republicans are actually doing in Congress relating to environmental changes and funding the EPA. I think it is important that the Congress and the American people know what is happening.

Today Vice President GORE said we are putting our kids in danger. He said that today more than 10 million American children under 10 currently under 12 currently living within 4 miles of a toxic waste site are at risk. The Vice President also said, yes, the era of big Government is over.

My colleagues, unfortunately, I think, the Vice President is talking out of both sides of his mouth to us. I think we need to set the record straight, and let me share with you some of the facts relating to what is going on with this great current Superfund site.

First of all, the Superfund Program has been in existence for 15 years, and only 75 sites out of several thousand identified sites out of several thousand identified sites have been cleaned up, an average of 5 sites per year. The average cost of a cleanup of a site is $30.7 million. The total cost to date in the Superfund Program to the Government and private sectors is about $25 billion. The Superfund costs the Government and private sector $4 billion annually for nonfederally owned sites.

However, only 53 percent of the total Superfund dollars are spent on cleaning up the sites. The rest of the money, and this is the Paul Harvey part of the story, the rest of the money, $1.3 billion annually, is spent on attorneys and studies.

So we are, under this current system of Superfund that the Vice President is so concerned about protecting, the money does not go to clean up these sites. The money goes back for attorneys' fees and studies, and you see out of all of the sites identified, several thousand, only a handful have, in fact, been cleaned up.

What about those children the Vice President spoke about today when he addressed group here in Washington? Are we taking care of the risk to human health and safety and welfare? How did the GAO report? This GAO report is June 17, 1994. Let me read this GAO report about the sites we are cleaning up.

Although one of the EPA's key policy objectives is to address the worst sites first. Relative risk plays little role in the agency's determination of priorities. EPA headquarters leave the task of setting priorities to the regions. Yet the regions do not even rank the sites by risk. So we find that we are not cleaning up the sites that pose, in fact, the most risk to our children, public health, and safety, and that the system that President GORE is protecting is really out of whack.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have also heard comments that EPA is going to, in fact, make polluters pay. We have to look at the record. The Vice President says this great system, in fact, currently makes polluters pay and we do not want to change that. In fact, look at these headlines, ''EPA Lets Polluters Off the Hook.'' In fact, under the current system, you find that very few of the dollars are collected by EPA.

The Lincoln Star reported, June 21, 1993, that internal EPA figures obtained by Associated Press showed the Agency has recovered only $843 million, or less than one-fifth of the $4.3 billion, in cleanup costs that could be recovered from polluters under the current law. So they are not doing it now. And these are the kinds of changes we want to make here.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you what this is about. This is about command and control bureaucracy here in Washington, DC. This is about how many employees EPA has. EPA has 5,924 of its nearly 17,850 employees in the entire agency. There are 6,000 here in Washington, DC. This is about command and control and bureaucracy, not about the environment.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1972

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I lent my name to the Independent Contractors Simplification act without fully comprehending the implications of this bill. I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1972.

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

There was no objection.

DEVASTATING EDUCATION CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are likely to take up another temporary spending bill to keep the Government open. Unfortunately, that bill will very likely contain the same

devastating education cuts that were put in place by the current continuing resolution.

These cuts in education are causing a crisis, truly a crisis in American education. I know in my school district and school districts all over this country, what they are trying to do at the moment is struggle and grapple with a plan for the upcoming school year.

How much money will they have available in order to carry out what their mission is, that is, to educate our children in this Nation? They have no idea today how much money they are going to have to carry out education functions.

The budget plan will have a tremendous, a tremendous impact on the lives of schoolchildren all over the country, and, in fact, they are going to have a tremendous impact on what happens for our future and the future of these young people.

My Republican colleagues offer no relief to these school districts. What we are likely to do tomorrow is extend the uncertainty for yet another week.

Let me pause a moment here to say that I often hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for the past year and 3 months talk about what they felt their mandate was in 1994. That is, they were going to come here, revolutionize the Congress, make it run like a business, a laudable goal. But what business do you know of that is open for 2 weeks, that closes for 2 weeks, that says to its vendors or the people who supply it with services, that maybe we will pay you, maybe we will not pay you, or maybe we will pay some and not others?

What business do you know that says we are only going to extend our services a week at a time? I do not know any business that does that that could stay in business.

So that this way of managing is truly incompetent, total mismanagement. And what is at stake here in the education area is the future and the lives of our young people and their ability to be able to compete in an international world, their ability to have an education, that they ultimately can work and work and get a living wage.

School districts, let me repeat, all over the country, are in the dark about the type of Federal assistance that they will be able to count on in order to continue what they are doing.

I went to a school in my district where I met with parents. I went to a kindergarten class, several of them, and I watched these little bits of kids at their computers with their earphones on and reading, identifying the alphabet, and looking at the letter C and saying yes, this is a cake, looking at the letter D and say this is a duck, this is a deer, and doing this with the computer, listening to stories with comprehension and then writing down what they hear there.

These are the kinds of initiatives that are in jeopardy because of the irresponsibility of this congressional majority.

The funding of these kinds of efforts is unknown, and therefore we do not know whether these programs will be able to continue, in addition to which one of the things we talk about in private education and private schools is that classroom sizes are very small so you have individual attention. Well, in our public school system, the classes are larger, and therefore we deal with aides who work with the teacher, who can get around to all the kids in the class. So that we are not only dependent on private education in this country which, but in fact that we have a good strong public education system.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, my kids went to public school. I believe in the public school system. Now, with a cutback, we will see those aides removed. So in public education, where you have an expanded and larger classroom, these children are not going to get the kind of attention that they need in order that they might learn and learn quickly and have opportunities available to them.

Worst of all, my Republican colleagues in the House are promising to continue the deep cuts in education that they have made so far this year, at a time when we know in this Nation that Americans are rightly anxious about their job security and at a time we all know that a good education is the key to a good job, congressional Republicans are launching an assault on American education.

Poll after poll shows that the American public overwhelmingly supports education and schools. As public servants, it is our duty to ensure that our schools are able to provide quality academic foundations for our kids to be able to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Despite this obligation, and that is one of the reasons we are sent here, congressional Republicans are making tough times even tougher for kids trying to get a good education and for their parents who want to see their kids get ahead. They are making the largest cuts in the history of Federal aid to education.

In addition, money is being cut for a school-to-work program. We have young people in this country who go to high school and then go to work. The majority of our young people do that. It is a small percentage that go on to a 4-year liberal arts college. It may be that that is okay. We may have enough history majors and enough English majors to take care of ourselves forever. But the aspirations and the values of these young people who want to go from school to work, those aspirations are being crushed.

We began the school-to-work program and it works. Talk to the business community, talk to the academic community, talk to the youngsters involved, they need to bridge that time between high school and the job market in order to go in and to be good, solid, professional workers.

We are going to pull away that funding for school to work.

The new temporary measure that funds education, which is known as a continuing resolution, is expected to continue to cut basic skills training, reading, and mathematics, by 17 percent; funding to keep our schools safe and free of drugs is expected to be cut once again by 25 percent.

Talk to any of the DARE officers, any of our law enforcement community who work in the program, in a DARE program, they tell you that this program is working, let us give it a chance. Let us work the bugs out. Let us start with our youngsters in the elementary grades and follow them along to see if this training has made a difference in what happens with drugs in our school and with our young people today. Let us give this program a chance. People who are working in it believe that it is working.

I also might add that our colleagues in the Senate, which I think is interesting to note, our colleagues in the Senate yesterday voted overwhelmingly, I think the vote was 84 to 16, to restore some of this funding in education for Head Start, for skills training, for school to work, for reading and mathematics readiness.

Yet, in today's Washington Times, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], commented, and this was only restoration of money for education because there is a recognition of how important education is in our lives, what kind of opportunity it provides to people in this country, Mr. ARMEY said: ''Well, isn't that typical of the Senate? All they want to do is spend money.''

Mr. Speaker, it was 84-to-16, a bipartisan vote on a Democratic amendment, I might add, but a bipartisan vote to restore some of the funding to education.

Before we can expect our kids to do all of the great things we wish for them, we indeed have to provide them with the essentials, training and basic skills, a safe place for them to learn.

It is in these areas where my Republican colleagues have made crippling cuts. Congress will soon face a choice: Will we allow my Republican colleagues to extend these cuts, or will they restore the funds that they have taken from America's classrooms and America's children? I can tell you in my State of Connecticut these cuts spell disaster. We cannot continue to do this; $8.6 million will be taken from the State of Connecticut for basic skills training; 9,200 needy students will go without. Schools in my district will lose $1.5 million. Under the safe-and-drug-free program, $729,000 will be cut for the State of Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, what makes these cuts so wrong-headed is that our Nation now stands at this crossroads. We can either choose to give our people the skills they need to compete and win in a global marketplace, or we can allow

our citizens to fall further and further behind as they compete with low-skill workers around the world for the lowest paying jobs in the world.

Getting a good education has always been a tremendous part of the American dream. It is what has enabled our people to succeed. Public education has been the great equalizer in this Nation. It is said to all children, let us emphasize your God-given talents. Let those talents take you to the highest pinnacles that you can reach.

These cuts will dash that dream for too many of our kids and for too many of the working families in this Nation.

As Congress considers a new spending message for the rest of the year, I urge my colleagues to remember the children in the classrooms all over America and the parents who have a bright hope for their kids' future. We need to restore the Federal funds that enable our children to make those dreams a reality.

I am delighted to be here this afternoon with several of my colleagues to talk about this issue of education, its importance in this country, and what the importance of these cuts are and what a devastating effect they will have on our kids future.

I yield to my colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for taking this time.

The title I program which you have talked about some, I decided it was time to put some faces in front of the statistics. You just look at programs as title I, what is wrong with cutting it 17 percent? I have been visiting title I programs across the State of West Virginia.

Of course, there is a problem too that you pointed out. All of our States have to prepare their budgets for the next school year now in the spring. In the State of West Virginia, on April 1 they have to post the list of transfers and layoffs by State law on April 1. So the fact that this Congress has not gotten around to getting them a 1996 budget, even though the Congress is working on a 1997 budget at this point, doubly compounds the problem. They are presently operating under the assumption there will be a 17-percent cut.

What that means to the State of West Virginia is on April 1 they will have to announce the layoffs of 226 title I teachers and 90 aides. Of the roughly 38,000 students that take advantage of the title I program across the State, title I being assistance in math and reading, but it has actually expanded far beyond that to be a total classroom approach in many of our schools, in addition to the 226 teachers and the 90 aides, 6,500 out of 38,000 students will not be able to get title I services.

Some would suggest maybe this perhaps needs to be cut. I would point out it has been cut and restricted significantly in past years. In one school district I was in yesterday, a few years ago there were seven schools that participated in it. Right now it is at three. If these cuts go into effect, it will probably be only two. Whether you are talking about Chesapeake Elementary School in Kanawka County, Rock Branch Elementary School in Putnam County, or Ransom Elementary School in Jefferson County, every one of them came out and parents took time off from work to come educate me about what title I meant.

If you listened to Melissa's mother at Rock Branch grade school begin crying as she pointed out how Melissa had been earning F's before the title I teacher intervened, Melissa is now earning B's and has a positive outlook on life.

If you listened to Mrs. Clark yesterday in Ransom Elementary School talk about how much her children had benefited from it and how concerned she was that this program would be cut back, or Patty Lavendar at Chesapeake Elementary School, who really saved the program when the Kanawha County Board of Education was having to look at where they would cut, that one was on the block. They were able to save the program because of the outpouring from the parents, the parental involvement. That is one of the things that title I focuses on, is parental involvement, not just teacher involvement.

So title I is a vital, vital program. It has always had strong bipartisan support. The interesting thing is we are now having to look to the Senate, which did restore basically the funding for title I yesterday, and hope that same spirit follows through over here.

This is a program that has blossomed. At one time it used to be a teacher pulling a few kids out of class and working on math and reading, and in some cases that is still the appropriate educational forum. But it is also a case where the title I teacher and aides are actually working in the classroom. They are working with the entire class in some situations, assisting that classroom teacher, as well as providing additional skills.

It is true that title I is a program that the formula is based upon free and reduced lunches in schools. But yet students benefit far beyond just those receiving free and reduced lunches.

In closing, my visits to title I programs have caused me to think anew what it is we are asking from Government. The fact of the matter is that for many parents, they do not have the resources of a Steve Forbes. They are not able to go out and hire resource rooms and teachers. They, by the same token, most parents do not have the resources to have a library of 1,000 or 2,000 volumes and CD–ROM disks and the computers that go with it. What we do as a people is pool our resources in something called education, and we pool it in title I.

One mother pointed out to me the other day her real concern that if title I was not there, what would be the outlook for her children in years to come? She says the very worst case would be possibly jail or prison, but at the least, a child has an increased frustration level, a child is not succeeding.

The one common element to every program I visited was self-esteem. The children were doing better because they felt better. There is nothing worse than a child, a young child who is having trouble reading and no one is reaching out to them, or having trouble with a certain subject and no one is reaching out to them. This helps them to develop those skills and move on.

So, as I say, I consider the cuts that have been passed by this House, 17 percent in title I alone, shortsighted. My concern is that the boards of education across the country are having to implement those even before they are finally passed, because they have to make some assumptions, and that the title I program is already suffering some impact, adverse impact, by actions, even though there has not been finality or closure yet on what the budget situation is.

My advice to every Member of the House is go visit a title I program.

Ms. DELAURO. You just encapsulized it. I think it is so critical. When I told you I went, there were 20 youngsters around the table. They had their sheets of paper and they were counting. You had the teacher, and what they had to do was count each of the lines, whether it was 7 or 6 or 8 in a row, and then they put their number in. The teacher took one-half, the aide had the other, and individually going to each child. And when they saw the answer, if the answer was correct, they put a C on it, and if it was not, they would go back and count with the youngster so that they would get it right and understand where they had made the error.

What we talk about in this body all the time, there are folks here who want to provide vouchers to families to be able to go to private schools where they get individual attention and they have all of the resources that are there. For God's sakes, we have got a resource. We have public education. We have a program that is providing this kind of individualized attention to these children. What we want to do is end it. It is to have half of that classroom or a fourth of that class there not have individual attention, and someone there who can help them with their self-esteem if they get it right, show them where they may have had an error, and let them move on and allow them to learn and progress. And it is mindless what is being done here with regard to education.

I would like to yield time to my colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS. No one has spent more time on this issue of education than the gentleman has. We are grateful to you for your commitment and vision.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Connecticut for the special order. We cannot come to this floor too often. We cannot say too much about education at this critical hour.

□ 1815

It is a critical hour, and I would like to use it to make one last appeal to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The majority, the Republican majority, has the power, and they can use that power to strengthen education and do a great deal for this Nation. They can use that power to wreck what has been accomplished to date in this country in terms of building some meager Federal support for the great educational apparatus that we have spread out across the country.

The Federal Government only has a small role, you know, of all the money spent for education. It is about 7 percent to 8 percent, and a large part of that goes into higher education.

So we only have a small role to begin with, but that role is critical. We are like the gyroscope on an airplane. That role is critical in terms of giving guidance and direction and inspiration and encouragement to the rest of the country.

When you do not have that support coming from the Federal Government, all kinds of things begin to happen at the local level. The commitment is lessened at the State level, the commitment is less than at the local level. We have had a retreat which has followed the drumbeat of the Republican majority here in Washington, a retreat across the country, in terms of Governors and legislatures and local mayors, in terms of commitment, their commitment to education.

What the Republicans have done, the majority of Republicans have launched a savage guerrilla warfare against education. I am baffled. I do not understand why the attack has been launched against the children of America, starting with the School Lunch Program, which baffled me greatly in terms of the amount of money. They squeezed some savings out, but the amount of money they saved is relatively small.

Yes, we want to eliminate inefficiencies; yes, we always want to eliminate waste. And that is a constant process. We must constantly strive to eliminate inefficiencies, to eliminate waste. We must constantly strive to get rid of incompetence and to replace it with competence and the best possible management. But more than that is being attempted here, and money seems not really to be the problem. We are not really talking about saving money. There seems to be a concerted effort to wreck, to recklessly destroy, the education improvement effort in America.

They call for the elimination of the Department of Education as key, and anyone observing the situation and understanding what is going on here, it is not about saving money only. It is about destroying the public education effort in America. Someone has made a determination that they can take care of a small elite group of children, students that they want to take care of, but they do not want the burden of educating all Americans, a commitment that is made from the very origins of the Nation. It is made not so much by the Federal Government, but certainly by the various State governments, and as the society has gotten to be more complex, that part of our Constitution which talks about promoting the general welfare is a joke if you do not focus your attention on improving education.

No modern society can prosper and grow without paying a great deal of attention to education, and all of our competing industrialized nations, they all clearly understand this. It might be that we may never want to go as far as Japan or Germany in terms of centralizing the direction of education through a Federal department; that is not necessary. But we are a long ways from that when you only have a 7-percent investment at the Federal Government level, a long ways from any centralization that is going to destroy local initiative.

Local control is there now. Local control will be there for a long time to go. If you increased education, the Federal share of education expenditures, by 25 percent, and we have a comparable amount of control, then you might have 25-percent Federal control, using that word, and 75-percent State and local control. Well, with 75-percent State and local control, it is still basically a State and local control operation. We have no danger of that happening with our 7-percent commitment.

We have to understand, however, that we cannot go forward and promote the general welfare, we cannot go forward and produce the kind of population, which is the greatest resource that any civilized nation can have right now, is an educated population. Our military might will do us no good if we do not have an educated population to win the economic competition. Our military might will not do us any good if we do not have an educated population, and we cannot maintain basic law and order, and we cannot have a society which is a viable society.

You know the kind of recklessness that we see first with the missiles aimed at the Department of Education and then the guerrilla warfare conducted against school lunches, and even the summer youth employment program is not a part of the school system, is not a part of the Department of Education; it is a basic part of the orientation of children as a basic part of a message that the Federal Government sends to children that it cares. And that, too, is under attack. Small amounts of money within the context of the overall Federal budget, but they have chosen to go after it anyhow. They have chosen to deal with the one area where there is some possible relief for local and State governments.

Local and State governments are under a lot of pressure, the expenses for education expenditures are increasing to deal with some of the modern requirements of education, and some of the myriad of problems faced by our schools means they need more money. Where can the money come from? It should come from the Federal Government. Certainly research and development, certainly support for populations that need extraordinary attention; that is the whole philosophy behind Title I and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We need more help from the Federal Government.

All taxes originate locally. Tip O'Neill used to say all politics is local. All taxes originate locally. The taxes that run the Federal Government come out of the pockets of people who live in cities and towns and school districts, and some portion of their taxes they should be able to get back in order to deal with the crisis in education. We ought to be able to get back more than 7 percent. To cut it off completely, however, and to wage a guerrilla warfare on the commitment that has been made, and chip away at it, as we are presently, is a reckless and savage act.

Jonathan Cozel uses the term ''savage inequalities'' when he is describing the differences between the best in America and the schools that are usually serving our poor and minority populations. But what we have here is a savage attack on the whole public school system, a savage attack that will destroy the effort that has been made over the years, and we were making some progress, even through Republican administrations, the steady movement from President Reagan's recognition of the fact that something had to be done when he commissioned the report that led to, commissioned a group that produced support called a Nation at Risk. Following that, George Bush and his efforts with America 2000, and all of it has just been one seamless effort, not such a disjointed partisan effort.

And suddenly, after President Clinton follows through on George Bush's goals, and we are moving in the same direction that the Governors and a whole lot of very intelligent and powerful people have decided we should move, suddenly the Republican majority in this House decides they want to wreck it all, they want to destroy it all. They are barbarians, and this is a barbaric act.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut, for taking this time.

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] makes an important point. It would be one thing if what we were considering was a well-thought-out proposal about the reform of one of these programs, if we were trying to better target the money, if we were trying to put it into a reducing the class size where we have students who are educationally handicapped or economically disadvantaged, some of the intensive title I. It would be different if we were asking people to refocus on a path that we thought would bring these young people a better education.

But this is simply the crass withdrawal of resources, and the gentleman from New York is so right. We have in the private sector, in the nonprofit sector, and in the public sector under the leadership of Presidents of both parties, we have tried to continue to develop the means by which we can improve the Nation's schools for all of our students, for those going to college and for those who are going to work and maybe to continuing education in connection with their employment.

But this is the first time where we just see the radical withdrawal of resources and say that is it, you take care of it, but with less resources.

You know, in the district that I represent in the San Francisco Bay area of California the school districts that are going to lose this money, the West Contra Costa School District, is going to lose $837,000. It has no ability to go out and to replace that money.

So, as I think the gentlewoman from Connecticut pointed out, this program is simply going to be withdrawn wholesale from schools as they start to retrench. That does not mean that children in that school are not deserving or needing of the additional resources that title I brings to that school, but they simply will be cut out of that because you are retrenching and trying to serve these. The same is true of the Mount Diablo School District. They have no ability to make up $324,000 of this, or—I see the gentlewoman from San Francisco here—$2 million. Here is a school district that just took an initiative on its own to try and reduce class size in the first 3 years of school because of the returns that they believe they will get with these children, and now they are going to withdraw $2 million from the school district.

This is not just about title I students, or title I classrooms, or title I schools. It is the entire drawdown on education resources that this kind of arbitrary and capricious decision—because this decision is simply a number picked out of a hat. It is not related to education reform, it is not related to educational preference. The gentleman from New York is exactly right. This is a dramatic and historic reversal of what has been a bipartisan trend to try and to improve and to upgrade the education and resources of this Nation so that the children can be gainfully employed, so they can go on to higher education, so they can take their place in the American economy.

And all of a sudden what we see is the wrecking crew comes in, and the wrecking crew says we are going to cut your resources by 17 percent. They do not ask you whether or not this is going to interrupt their reforms, they do not ask you whether or not this means our children are going to go without research. They just picked this number out of a hat.

Now fortunately, as you both mentioned, the Senate maybe sees it another way and maybe wants to continue the notion of the reforming of our schools. And I just want to say this. You know, if people had been visiting their schools and visiting with the parents, and we had the President in for Nut Day in the Mount Diablo School District in my district, and a number of parents showed up with their children in tow, excited about the expanded educational opportunities that being on the Internet would mean for their children.

People again, because of the economy, because of this problem of sliding wages and living standards, are revaluing, revaluing education, and they know that they need more out of it, that their children need more out of it, and at the exact same time of course the Republicans have been out of step with the public on most of their agenda, but at the exact same time where America is revaluing education and the teachers of education, the Republicans walk in with the wrecking ball and just knock it all down and remind you. This is a lesser of the cuts. The House Republicans, these cuts would have been much deeper. They were looking for deeper cuts than this.

And I think the gentleman from New York just makes an excellent point, that this is not a strategy to improve or reform our schools. This is just the wholesale withdrawal of resources, and we should reject it, if we get a second chance in the House. Hopefully maybe the Senate provision will hold, and we will stop this just arbitrary playing of politics with the future of our Nation's children.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and the gentleman from New York.

Ms. DELAURO. I just want to add one point. Your notion about when you are retrenching is that you pull out that money. If the school districts decide that it is important enough to do and they want to do it, where are they going to go for the funding? They are going to a property tax, and they are going to look at increased revenues, and most of that comes with increased taxes for people in your district and my district and districts everywhere.

And then the other piece is that they cannot do that, they do not want to risk raising the taxes; so, as you said, it is gone, and the ripple effect of that going is just enormous, and you cannot even calculate it.

Mr. OWENS. Why should they raise property taxes and other taxes when the Federal Government has a tremendous amount of waste that ought to be transferred into education? Just to give one example. Most Americans are not aware of the fact that auditors at the CIA found $2 billion. Hear me carefully; I use the word B—billion—$2 billion was found in the petty cash funds that they had lost track of.

Ms. DELAURO. At the CIA.

Mr. OWENS. At the CIA.

□ 1830

Two billion dollars. There is an agency that the President does not know has $2 billion, the director does not know has $2 billion, it is just wandering around there. Think of what that could do for the education budget. One and one-tenths billion dollars of those $2 billion could go to end the cuts. That is the exact amount of the cuts, the $1.1 billion proposed for title I.

You could take another $300 million for Head Start. Those are the Head Start cuts proposed. You could take $600 million for the summer youth employment program. It is $2 billion. That adds up to quite a bit for education funding.

People of America should not rally to fill up the gaps when our Federal Government really has the resources, and the resources are still going in the wrong directions. They are being wasted, and not being directed at the priority of the moment. The priority of the moment is an educated population in America. We need more money in education from the Federal Government.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] to join the conversation.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her leadership in this body, and particularly this evening, for calling this special order on education.

I would like to follow up on what has been said earlier by my colleagues. As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and also as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations, I saw firsthand the budgeting for the intelligence budget, and I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] on his observation about our spending priorities; and then also on the front line in our subcommittee, when we saw the $1 billion being slashed from title I, with the blink of an eye.

When we said to our Republican colleagues, ''But what will happen to the 1 million children who will not be able to have access to Title I services,'' they said ''We have to cut somewhere.'' As our colleague, the gentleman from California, said——

Ms. DELAURO. In reading and mathematics.

Ms. PELOSI. It would be one thing if they brought in a critique or criticism of title I, and they said, ''This is where we think the same number of children or even more children could be served with the same money or less money by addressing some reforms,'' but they could not criticize title I. Title I is effective. It does the job. The money will mean that 1 million children will not be served.

In California, and I would like to put some observations on the record, in California, that will mean over $123,000,000 out of our one State, over 100,000 children will no longer have this special assistance for reading and math. That is why I rise also and join you to express my great concern about the future of our Nation's education programs at the hands of the Republican majority in the House.

So drastic was this cut that even the Republicans in the Senate abandoned it. So drastic was it that they agreed to add back billions of dollars for education, because they knew that they were slashing right at the heart of America.

Following up on something the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], said earlier about our entire budget, we hear a great deal of talk around here about how we have to reduce the deficit, and therefore we have to cut the budget to do that, cut spending to do it. But the very idea of cutting education, and that is going to increase our deficit, unless we invest in our children, enrich their lives, make them productive members of society, increase our competitiveness internationally, we are going down a path of increasing the deficit and increasing the national debt, because we are not investing in our greatest resource, our children.

Our Federal commitment to education is truly a measure of our sincerity about economic recovery, social progress, and our children's future, again. In the House omnibus appropriations bill, as has been mentioned, $3.3 billion is cut from the Department of Education, $3.3 billion, or 13 percent; as has been mentioned, a 17-percent cut in compensatory education, title I.

Ironically, just this week, March 15, the Ides of March and the last day for this CR is also the day that California school districts are required to notify teachers whether or not they will have jobs in the fall. Unless funding for title I is restored, thousands of California teachers and teachers' aides will lose their jobs. Tell me how that is going to help the children of California.

In the House bill also, funding for safe and drug-free schools, an issue that I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has worked very hard on, will be cut by $12 million or 25 percent. The safe-and-drug-free-schools program is vital, especially to urban school districts like the one I represent in San Francisco.

The drastic cuts proposed by this funding would place in jeopardy the most vulnerable students. Basic needs that help young people survive cannot be addressed. At-risk children need the assistance that these programs offer.

Funding for bilingual education in California would be cut by $18 million, or 32 percent, one-third of the funding for bilingual education. We talk about wanting everyone to speak English and making English the official language, and yet we are cutting funding for bilingual education. Anyone who supports any initiatives for English-only has to be a staunch supporter for bilingual education. That funding should follow. I, myself, do not subscribe to that theory of English as the official language, but ironically, those who do are just the ones who want to cut the funding for bilingual education.

No funds for Goals 2000, the bill the President requested, $750 million. As the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] said earlier, these programs were developed under a Republican President, President Bush, with bipartisan cooperation of Republican and Democratic Governors across the country, passed in a bipartisan fashion in the House, signed by a Republican President, and yet zeroed out in the labor, health, and human services, and education bill.

I almost think we should strike education from the name of the committee, because we have taken such a blow at the education funding. I have more facts and figures, but I know my colleagues need time. I do not know how much time can be allocated. Perhaps I can resume later.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on the point of the Goals 2000, which unfortunately has become a political football, it has become a political football in Washington, DC, but not in the States. In the States where it was originally designed by the Governors and brought to the Congress with recommendations made, it is being embraced now as, again, parents hunger to know that their children are going to have to meet world class standards; that this education is the very best education; that we should not accept the dumbing down of education, we should not accept a second-class education; that our children not only deserve the very best education, but in fact the world's economy requires that they be given that.

Now we just see that swept aside in a fit of ideology, in just an absolute fit of some kind of extreme ideology that says that the Governors should not have a right to apply for this money, to upgrade the quality and the class.

These standards that are being developed are being developed with private sector associations. The American Electronics Association wants to be able to develop standards and have them incorporated so a young student can take that and go anywhere in the United States and work, and the employer will know that that certificate, that diploma, means that that person is qualified to do that job and to enter that industry, and to participate in that.

What do we have today? We have in many instances diplomas that do not mean anything. That is what Goals 2000 is about, it was about upgrading that. It is swept aside in this provision. It is just crazy that this kind of extreme ideology would drive these kinds of education decisions, because it is not even a matter of debate. It is just a matter of pulling these numbers out of the hat. As the gentlewoman said, in her committee, unfortunately, the attitude was ''Well, we have to cut somewhere.''

All things are not equal. Whether or not a child gets a first-class education, as the gentlewoman so correctly pointed out, the gentlewoman from San Francisco, that is the beginning and the end. That is either the beginning of a wonderful life in this country, or it can be the end of that. It is a question of whether that is the beginning of your productivity, that is the beginning of your being able to provide for yourself and have economic self-sufficiency, or if you choose to start a family. That is what that education is about.

Somehow the people who cheapen that education are now the Republicans, because they slash it again without blueprint, without detail. They simply pick a number and say ''This is the number we are going to give the President to spend, because we are angry at him because we got caught shutting down the government,'' or something. The whole thing is just a tantrum and a fit of anger that really is an insult to parents of this Nation who are struggling to educate their children. I want to thank the gentlewoman again for taking this time.

Ms. DELAURO. I want to thank my colleague. I would like to mention a couple of things. One is that there is all this talk about how we cannot spend this money and we have to cut, and it is the Democrats who want to spend all of this money. But what they do not want to tell us about is where they do want to spend money, and that is on the tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans.

They will deal with repealing the alternate minimum tax, and expatriots getting a break for renouncing their citizenship and being able to not pay any taxes. They do not have any problem at that end. But with kids and their future, they say, ''We have to cut back, we have to tighten our belts.''

The AmeriCorps Program, let me just say this, this is a program that says to young people, ''We will help you with your college education if and only if you give back something to your community, you exercise some responsibility for getting this assistance. We want you to participate in the life of your community.''

We are trying to teach our young kids values and responsibility. We are caught up today with saying young people do not have any responsibility, the ''me generation,'' the x generation; that they just want to take something and not do anything. This is a program that goes after that very fundamental value that we have tried to instill in people of responsibility and taking on something, and it is working.

Again, it is working all over this country. Young people are involved in the lives of their communities and are given some help to be able to further their college education. Now we are saying ''Forget it. No. It is over.'' We have about 800 kids in Connecticut who are going to be just cut off of that program, not only the work they are doing in the community, but their ability to be able to go to school.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, in less than 2 years the barbarian Republican majority has destroyed all of that. A

piece of civilization that has been wrecked by the pressure that has been put on them, budget-wise. We have large numbers of people being forced to sort of retire early and drop out. Experienced administrators and experienced teachers are going. You have large numbers of people who are planning to get out, and are just marking time in the system. You have reductions in any investment in equipment and plant buildings.

They have, in less than 2 years, done an amazing job. I tremble when I watch what the blitzkrieg against education has accomplished so far. The American people had better take note of what you can do with the appropriations process, how you send a message out there. As well as take away the dollars, you send a message to every level of government that public education is expendable, public education is no longer a part of the grand design of a great America. They have accomplished that in less than 2 years, the Republican barbarians.

Ms. PELOSI. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, and when we think that this is done in the context of a $250 billion tax break to the wealthiest people in our country, $250 billion, and we are here talking about $3 billion or $4 billion. Could they not make the tax break that much less? It is penny-ante. It is change to them. It is a little bit of money when it is a tax break, but it is all the money in the world when we are trying to deal with education.

Mr. OWENS. They are not rational. That is the most foolish thing.

Mr. PELOSI. I think there is a lack of understanding by some of our Republican colleagues about how this issue is understood in the country.

As a member of the subcommittee, I get many calls and letters, et cetera, from very different people; not the usual folks who usually call, but members of PTA's across the country. This has gone beyond the usual advocacy groups who will pay attention to what goes into legislation in Congress. This is well beyond that. This is parents, members of PTA's and the rest, members of school boards across the country. They are not particularly political, but they understand how this is going to affect their neighborhood schools. That is critically important.

I certainly think the Senators understand, because they put back almost all of the $2.7 billion. I think nothing speaks more eloquently to the bankruptcy of the policy in this House on education funding than the fact that even the Republican Senators disassociated themselves from it and came back with $2.7 billion, which I hope we can get into the House bill, or in conference back in.

The other point I want to make is that in the course of all of this appropriating, our colleagues on the Republican side say, ''We will put more money back into some of these programs, contingent upon the House passing a separate bill, a reconciliation bill, and then we will have money for education, if you pass a balanced budget bill in 7 years, a reconciliation bill.''

We can never let that stand, that children are contingent upon some reconciliation bill. Children are a first priority. This is not something we do when we see how much money we have left over from tax breaks and an increased defense budget that the Pentagon did not even ask for. This is what we do first, take care of our children, educate them; that is, if we have, I think, our priorities in order.

Our budget must be a statement of our national values. It must reflect what is important to us, and that is what we would put our resources to. It certainly is not, in the case of the budget we have before us.

□ 1845

Of course, that goes on to higher education, as well. Eliminates 13 percent for student financial assistance, less than 1995, eliminates the Perkins Loan Program, and the direct loan program is capped at 40 percent, and further reductions, which will again pose an obstacle for people without means or middle-income people in our country to receive the benefits of higher education.

Then it goes on and on to what has happened to job training, school-to-work, lifetime learning, reflecting that our economy is a different one and that people in the work force must be constantly educated in a lifetime, but much of that job training funding is also cut on the labor side of the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. I might say that the Senators restored the education cuts, but there are other problems that we have with the bill for cuts that were not restored.

I would be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentlewoman from Connecticut mentioned that our Republican colleagues and sometimes the editorial boards get mad at us when we talk about the cuts to children that were scheduled in the school lunch program or in student loans or in title I or Medicare and Medicaid cuts. We say they are taking from the neediest people in this country to provide this tax cut, and yet here is the graphic example.

Here are children that are identified as economically disadvantaged, as educationally disadvantaged, and we try to target some resources into the schoolrooms where those children reside, and yet we find out that as we read down the impacts in the State of California, district after district, school after school, 150 students, 170 students, 694 students, 1,000 students, 131 students, it goes on and on and on, these children.

This is not abstract. I have been teaching the last several Monday mornings at a continuation high school, and I visited with the teachers at Olympic High School after I was done with my class period, and they said, here is the impact of the cuts. This woman, who is helping these young people with business subjects and is here as a student assistant, she is gone if we lose this. In their budget, they had some upgrades for the computers. They thought maybe they were going to get hooked up to the net. That is not going to happen now.

Those children are losing those kinds of resources and that kind of access. These are among some of the most disadvantaged children in our society, and we have decided that we would rather cut them than ask if the wealthy could just wait until there is a balanced budget, just wait until there is a dividend, and let us see if that is what the country wants to do.

But here we are whacking up the education budget on an arbitrary manner, and the job opportunity budget, the AmeriCorps budget that is trying to send a message to young people in this country that they care, that they matter, that they are a resource, that they can make a difference in our communities.

The brilliance of AmeriCorps, like Vista that was before it, is not what that individual does, but they become a catalyst for other resources in the community. They attract somewhere between $10 and $25 for every dollar they get in in-kind services and help from other organizations. That is the message we want to send young people.

We keep blaming young people. We keep getting mad at young people. We blame the education establishment after we withdraw the resources. The next thing what will become is the same people who cut these budgets are going to tell us, they could not educate the kids, so give them a voucher and send them down the road. They will be cutting the vouchers once that is accomplished.

As MAJOR OWENS said, people better wake up and understand the kind of systematic, comprehensive assault that public education is under in this Congress by the Republicans. This is not an accident. We say it is arbitrary. It was not arbitrary in their minds. They made the decision that this is where they were going to cut the budget, not in the waste in the CIA, not in the waste in other programs, programs that you cannot even debate on this floor. This is systematic. This is intentional, and it is about the destruction of the public education system in this country and certainly the Federal contribution to that effort.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. DELAURO. Again, it was MAJOR OWENS who mentioned the issue of military might. If we only measure this Nation in terms of its military might, our national security is at great risk. Education is as much a part of what the national security of this country is all about as is the number of weapons that we have in our arsenals.

I come from a State that is defense dependent, that depends on tanks and

aircraft and engines. But I will tell you that if we do not have the young people who are smart enough and competent enough to be designing and manufacturing and doing all those things, our national security is at great risk. When we cut preschool and when we cut school lunch and we cut summer employment, and when we cut skills training and when we cut higher education, we are doing an enormous disservice to the national security of this country.

Mr. OWENS. Our economic viability is directly threatened. Education is the basis for the kind of skills that we need in order to compete economically. Bangalore, India is now called the computer programming capital of the world, Bangalore, India which is in a country which is considered a developing nation. But they have as good a computer program in English as you have anywhere in the world, and many of the companies of this country are contracting their computer programming to Bangalore, India where they can get a year's worth of work for a month's salary, what they pay to computers in this country.

Economically the competition is going to broaden, and the competition economically will be more dependent upon the educated population that a nation has and the way it utilizes that educated population. People are not going to have the jobs if they do not have the skills and the education.

The corporations that are now uniting with the Republican majority to cut the budget for education are the same corporations that are asking for, in the immigration bill, that we allow them to keep bringing in technicians.

Ms. DELAURO. Foreign workers.

Mr, OWENS. And people at high levels, especially computer programmers, in order to fill the gap they have here for computer programmers. So it is all interwoven, interconnected, and we cannot maintain a military power if we do not maintain our economic might.

We cannot provide for average families and keep the economy healthy unless we have a strong school system which is dedicated to the education of all children, not an elitist system seeking to get away with just educating one portion of the population and allowing the other portion of the population by triage to go overboard and not provide them with a decent education.

Ms. DELAURO. My colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Yes. I know the focus of this special order is education and the Republican cuts, and that is most appropriate, but I want to also point out that these cuts are not made in a vacuum. Our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], talked about community service in AmeriCorps, as did the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], and I wanted to just add something briefly there because I think we will have to have our own special order on community service cuts, too, but they are related to education.

In the same Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill there are drastic cuts in community service, and some of the programs affected are RSVP, foster grandparents, et cetera. In our testimony, all the testimony that we get from professional judgment opinions and testimony of those who have to justify the spending in their agencies, looks to what the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] said.

For every dollar you spent on an AmeriCorps volunteer, you get at least $25 return on your investment. So, too, with community service across the board, also contained in this bill. It flies in the face of the trend, because what we are saying here is everybody wants to reduce the deficit, right? So how do we use the spending to the best advantage? Of course we educate our children. That is an investment.

But we also had what they call the twin engines of paid supervisors and thousands of volunteers, but who need the employees in place to organize their work and them, in order for us to have the big payoff in our society of people coming together and helping children to read or taking seniors to the park or whatever it happens to be to meet the need. It was referred to as the catalytic power of community service.

This is what we should be doing if we want to reduce the deficit, is make sure that the dollars that we spend are investment and that they have a multiplier effect across the board. When we cut those dollars for community service, we are really going backward. It does not take an economic genius to see the worth of all of that, the power of men and women across the country volunteering.

But subtract the Federal commitment there and you lose the supervision, the organization, the guidance and the catalyst for making all of that work. So these education cuts are taking place at the same time as we are making community service cuts. Begging off of AmeriCorps captures both aspects of it, education and community service, and it does a grave disservice, whether it is to civic associations or volunteerism in our country or, as President Bush so aptly called it, 1,000 points of light. Let us support President Bush's 1,000 points of light by fueling and funding the community service agencies that we have in Government.

Ms. DELAURO. I want to thank my colleagues for joining me tonight. If there is a place we can cut, we do not have to repeal the alternate minimum tax. We could apply $17 billion to either the deficit or doing some of these other things.

THE REAL WORLD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION FUNDING

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, now let us move from fantasy land to the real world. I think that would be a good approach. I would have thought, after what I heard, that somehow or other the Federal Government was in charge of public education in this country, even though we only spend 6 percent of all the money that is spent, 6 percent.

Under our plan, incidentally, we spend $340.8 billion over the next 7 years on education. Compare that with the former majority that was just speaking. During their last 7 years, they spent $315.1 billion. All those cuts you heard about does not quite add up, does it? Because ours is an 8.1 percent increase.

Now, what is the problem? the problem is that we want to do something differently. I agree with the former chairman that I sat beside who would say to me on occasions, ''Bill, these programs are not working,'' and I would say, ''I know it, Mr. Chairman. Let's change them.''

The chairman would always say, ''We cannot do that because the money might not get to the right place.'' And I would say, ''Well, if it isn't doing any good getting there, what good does it do to get to it the right place?''

But all those years I sat there saying there were different ways to do this. We have to make changes. All the studies, I wish the last group would have unveiled all of their studies showing all of the accomplishments, because every study we have from the department, every study we have from an outside group would indicate, as a matter of fact, that we are doing more poorly today than we did 10 years ago, after we poured all of this money into these programs.

Let me also point out that when we talk about spending on education, spending on education in the States alone rose from $60 billion in 1983 to $115 billion in 1993. During the same period, local contributions to education grew from $55 billion to $120 billion. State and local governments have increased their spending over that 10-year period by 100 percent.

What results do we have from all of this spending? According to the national assessment of education progress, reading, average reading proficiency among 9-year-olds was about the same in 1992 as it was in 1971. Math average, mathematics proficiency among 9 to 13, was slightly higher in 1992 than 1973, but for 17-year-olds the same. Science. Science, we went backwards for 17-year-olds. It is lower.

So on and on you go, and all we are saying as a new majority is that we have scarce dollars. We know that.