atmosphere surrounding the visit. The more appropriate auspices would have been a working visit President Clinton used to welcome many other leaders of important countries to Washington, DC.

Tomorrow, though, Project Democracy in China, of the Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars and the Tiananmen Memorial Foundation, will hold a press conference, and I join with them in their aspirations when they call upon the President and the United States to demand that China's human rights record be condemned, its prisoners of conscience released, and demand political reform in China.

I urge my colleagues to join us in Lafayette Square for a protest rally at 12 noon in front of the White House.

RECOGNITION OF GOOD SCIENTIFIC WORK BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, very often from this podium we hear criticism of our Government and of our Nation, and rightfully so, because we exercise an oversight role. But I believe we have an obligation also to point out when the Government does something good and something right. I would like to mention two such items that have happened recently.

First of all, Dr. William Phillips, of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, recently shared a Nobel Prize for physics for research that he had done on cooling atoms. This is a very esoteric field of research, and it has real promise for the future, particularly for precise timekeeping, and will improve our time-standard accuracy by a factor of 100.

In a recent science magazine I noticed also that William H.F. Smith from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and David Sandwell from Scripps Institution have succeeded in mapping the world, including the ocean floors, from satellites. What I am displaying here is a remarkable map, obtained for the first time in history, showing all the topographical details of the land and undersea surfaces. This will be extremely useful in analyzing effects such as El Nino and determining how to improve our fisheries.

I commend these scientists as well as Dr. Phillips for the good work they have done. We are proud of them, and proud to have them as Government employees.

REPUBLICANS OFFER THE NATION'S CHILDREN HOPE AND OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed with my friends across the aisle. They support the status quo for our Nation's education.

Why do they consistently oppose efforts to improve the lives and learning of our Nation's children? The Republican education agenda is simple: We want to give kids a chance. We want them to be able to leave inferior schools that cannot even teach them to read and write. We want parents involved in the children's education and to trust the schools they send their kids to every day.

I do not care if these schools are charter schools, public schools, private schools, or a school on Mars, but it is not fair to force our kids to go to schools where they sit in constant fear for their lives, where the roofs leak and the heat does not work. Why force kids to go to schools that do not teach? Let them attend a school where they can have a real educational experience and a real long-term potential.

It is simple: The Republicans offer the Nation's children hope and opportunity, while across the aisle all they can offer is status quo.

SAY NO TO EXPLOITING CHEAP LABOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I noticed yesterday that the President gave a speech and he said that those who oppose his fast track authority have an ignorance of the new world international economy.

I saw the face of the new world economy last weekend, and I would like the President to hear about it. He should go to Juarez, Mexico: a 77-percent increase in maquiladora jobs since fast track passed.

Two-earner families living in hovels without water, heat, or even walls. They are made of pallets and packing crates. Working 45 hours a week for U.S. corporations, jobs that were here before NAFTA, for $40 a week. No environmental controls, no labor protections, no right to organize. That is the face of the new world economy, Mr. President.

There is one place we are running a surplus today, that is in Latin and South America. And now the President wants fast track authority to go down there and see if he can screw that up too, and take more of our jobs south of the border so our corporations can exploit cheap labor and the environment. No.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
Washington, DC, October 27, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Monday, October 27, 1997 at 11:42 a.m.: That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2013.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

□ 1215

COMMUNICATION FROM DEPUTY GENERAL COUNSEL OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER) laid before the House the following communication from Jennifer L. Smith, Deputy General Counsel, Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 27, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Congressional Budget Office has been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel of the House of Representatives, I will make the determinations concerning the subpoena as required under the Rule.

Sincerely yours,

JENNIFER L. SMITH,
Deputy General Counsel, Congressional Budget Office.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 139) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Department of Education, States, and local education agencies should spend a greater percentage of Federal education tax dollars in our children's classrooms, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 139

Whereas we know that effective teaching takes place when we begin (1) helping children master basic academics, (2) engaging

and involving parents, (3) creating safe and orderly classrooms, and (4) getting dollars to the classroom;

Whereas our Nation's children deserve an educational system which will provide opportunities to excel;

Whereas States and localities must spend a significant amount of Federal education tax dollars applying for and administering Federal education dollars;

Whereas several States have reported that although they receive less than 10 percent of their education funding from the Federal Government, more than 50 percent of their paperwork is associated with those Federal dollars;

Whereas while it is unknown exactly what percentage of Federal education dollars reaches the classroom, a recent audit of New York City public schools found that only 43 percent of their local education budget reaches the classroom. Further, it is thought that only 85 percent of funds administered by the United States Department of Education for elementary and secondary education reach the school district level. Even if 65 percent of Federal education funds presently reach the classroom, it still means that billions of dollars are not directly spent on children in the classroom;

Whereas American students are not performing up to their full academic potential, despite significant Federal education initiatives, which span multiple Federal agencies;

Whereas, according to the Digest of Education Statistics, in 1993 only $141,598,786,000 out of $265,285,370,000 spent on elementary and secondary education was spent on ''instruction'';

Whereas, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, in 1994 only 52 percent of staff employed in public elementary and secondary school systems were teachers;

Whereas too much of our Federal education funding is spent on bureaucracy, and too little is spent on our Nation's youth;

Whereas getting 90 percent of Department of Education elementary and secondary education funds to the classroom could provide substantial additional funding per classroom across the United States;

Whereas more education funding should be put in the hands of someone in a child's classroom who knows the child's name;

Whereas burdensome regulations and mandates should be removed so that school districts can devote more resources to children in classrooms;

Whereas President Clinton has stated: ''We cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we've got now.'';

Whereas President and Vice President Gore agree that the reinventing of public education will not begin in Washington but in communities across America and that we must ask fundamental questions about how our public school systems' dollars are spent; and

Whereas President Clinton and Vice President Gore agree that in an age of tight budgets, we should be spending public funds on teachers and children, not on unnecessary overhead and bloated bureaucracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives urges the Congress, the Department of Education, States, and local educational agencies to—

(1) determine the extent to which Federal elementary and secondary education dollars are currently reaching the classroom;

(2) work together to remove barriers that currently prevent a greater percentage of funds from reaching the classroom; and

(3) work toward the goal that at least 90 percent of the United States Department of Education elementary and secondary education program funds will ultimately reach classrooms, when feasible and consistent with applicable law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS], the author of the resolution.

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me today to stand before the House to support the Dollars to the Classroom resolution, an initiative I have been working on since early this year. As a former high school math and science teacher in public schools and because my own children have been educated in public schools, I know of the importance of America's public schools. With this background, I rise today in strong support of America's public schools and the students that attend them each day.

Today the House will have a chance to strongly support public education when we vote on the Dollars to the Classroom resolution. The Dollars to the Classroom resolution urges that we get at least 90 percent of Federal education tax dollars to the classroom, to the individual who knows the name of each child. This could mean an additional $1,800 in public classrooms across America.

Do my House colleagues realize that currently we are wasting billions of education tax dollars each year? Let me give Members an example of this waste. The Department of Education funds tens of thousands of publications, 21,922 to be exact, that are available for each of us to purchase, for a fee I might add.

There are 140 studies on checklists that are listed. There are 13 studies on welding. There are 260 studies on surveys. There are 26 studies on camping. There are close to 100 studies on education researchers researching their research techniques. There are three studies entitled ''Cement: The Concrete Experience.'' I would rather empower teachers to buy books for classrooms than to fund studies on cement.

In short, the question is, do we fund bureaucrats or books? A vote against the Dollars to the Classroom resolution is really a vote for the bureaucracy. We do not want to become so entrenched in the beltway mindset that we have forgotten why we are here.

Let me take a minute to remind my colleagues. We are here for kids like Melissa who writes, and I quote, ''My social studies book was new in 1988. Hey, it's 1997. We need to get new books.'' And Glenisha who says, and I quote, ''I support this bill because it seems as if people are taking our parents for granted, because they're paying taxes which they assume are to schools, but most of the money doesn't make it to the classroom where it should be. We should have had this bill a long time ago.''

Mr. Speaker, if Members will not take my word for it, at least listen to the children who attend public schools across America each day, or listen to the teachers.

Helen Martin, a teacher in the Unionville-Chadds Ford School District in Pennsylvania stated this: ''It is very frustrating to see so much tax money go to Washington for education and not to see funds in the classroom that have been appropriated for education. Please return more education tax dollars directly to the students of our Nation who will become the scientists, business people and lawmakers of the 21st century.''

Mr. Speaker, I beg Members to not turn a deaf ear to the children and the teachers of our Nation. Let us get America's hard earned tax dollars away from beltway bureaucrats and into the classroom. Let us use the money for books, computers, maps, microscopes, and teachers.

It is our choice. We have a vote today that will impact America's kids. We have a moral responsibility to drastically improve our current education system for our children. If we are really serious about supporting public schools, the choice is clear. Vote for the Dollars to the Classroom resolution. Vote for the kids in the public education system.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD:

MOVING DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM

(By Representative Joseph Pitts)

''People are taking our parents for granted, because they're paying taxes which they assume are to schools, but most of the money doesn't make it to the classroom where it should be''—5th Grader Glenisha Danyelle McLellan

Glenisha's statement is undeniable—a significant portion of federal education dollars do not make it into classrooms. In the midst of rapidly growing federal education budget, the actual amount of funds making it into classrooms—where the fundamental basics of reading, writing, and arithmetic are taught—is being siphoned off by an increasingly large Washington-based education bureaucracy.

As a former high school math and science teacher, I have seen and experienced firsthand the funding shortfalls many schools face each year. Some have tartered textbooks dating back more than a decade. In many urban areas, teachers lack the funds to buy basic necessities such as new crayons, pencils and paper for their students. Year after year, thousands of teachers nationwide—in affluent and poor districts alike—are not given the proper resources to conduct the necessary classroom experiments that facilitate the learning process.

After one studies this ''resource gap'' in our nation's classrooms, it becomes abundantly clear that the answer to these problems does not lie in increased education funding. Indeed, the problem in education is not how much we spend, but how we spend it. By propping up bureaucracies instead of providing local schools, teachers and parents with the resources they need, we have failed our nation's children.

In his most recent State of the Union address, President Clinton declared that education would be his ''number one priority for the next four years.'' Mr. Clinton should fulfill that commitment by working to ensure that a very high percentage of every federal dollar spent on education is channeled directly to a classroom, instead of remaining in the seemingly endless labyrinth of programs which originate in Washington, DC. This goal is one that has already been embraced by Republicans.

At present, it is unknown exactly what percentage of federal education dollars reach the classroom. What is known, however, is that the federal education bureaucracy is a multi-layered behemoth that saps up billions of dollars that are desperately needed in America's classrooms.

As part of the effort of the Republican majority to ensure that more dollars are directed into classrooms, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce has initiated a far-reaching project—''Education at a Crossroads: What Works? What Is Wasted?''—to evaluate the extent and quality of federal involvement in education. Led by Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Chairman Pete Hoekstra (R-MI), the Committee has unearthed a federal education bureaucracy consisting of 760 different programs in 40 separate departments and agencies, costing taxpayers more than $100 billion a year (1997 figures).

Currently, the federal government spends approximately $15.4 billion on elementary and secondary education programs. The best estimate suggests that about $5.4 billion never reaches the classroom. Instead, this money is consumed by numerous layers of administration, paperwork, publications, studies, and an intensive grant application process.

This federal bureaucracy, coupled with the waste endemic in many state education bureaucracies, results in fewer and fewer dollars actually reaching the classroom. For instance, a recent audit of New York City public schools found that only 43 percent of the local education budget reached the classroom. The *Wall Street Journal* has reported (3/27/96) that 24.6% of U.S. public education spending (federal, state, and local) goes to non-teaching personnel.

The U.S. Department of Education (USDE) is chock full of examples of wasteful spending. In many cases, programs and policies can be eliminated, thus freeing up more resources to be utilized directly by those actually doing the teaching.

Two prime examples are the USDE's voluminous collection of ''studies,'' and the time-consuming grant process. While there are certainly other problem areas that need a close examination, these two serve as effective ''case studies.''

CEMENT: THE CONCRETE EXPERIENCE

According to the USDE, it ''publishes a wealth of information for teachers, administrators, policymakers, researchers, parents, students, and others with a stake in education.'' A recent search of the USDE's Home Page on the World Wide Web found that the database currently contains descriptions of 21,922 different studies published since 1980. The subjects covered in these reports span the horizon, ranging from Eskimos to cement.

A brief, and by no means comprehensive, examination of the list of studies reveals:

1767 studies on career planning;

140 studies on check lists;

Nearly 100 studies on education researchers researching their research techniques;

260 studies on surveys;

3 studies on ''Cement: The Concrete Experience''; and

82 studies on calculators.

And that is just a small fraction of a small sampling of the publications available.

Additionally, these reports are not available for free; the USDE charges a fee for each report, so those wondering what ''Cement: The Concrete Experience'' is all about must pay to find out. This is a tragic waste of taxpayer dollars. Not only are the bureaucrats in Washington consuming money that could be directed to local schools to fund studies on all-too-often irrelevant topics, but the USDE then forces teachers to use limited classroom resources to purchase copies of the few studies that may prove useful.

This dizzying logic lends an insight into the USDE's funding priorities. As President Herbert Hoover once noted: ''In all bureaucracies there are three implacable spirits—self-perpetuation, expansion, and incessant demand for more power.'' Indeed.

GRANT PROCESS: 21 WEEKS, 216 STEPS

Another frustrating example of waste in the federal education system is the extraordinarily long grant application process teachers across the country must endure. The USDE has made applying for a grant so complicated that many teachers never even bother, feeling the benefits (the money) don't outweigh the costs (countless lost hours).

Teachers who do choose to try to secure federal grants must waste hours upon hours on an application process that takes 21 weeks and churns through no less than 216 tedious steps of bureaucratic red tape. And that's just to apply for a grant. In the end, there is no guarantee of actually receiving the funds.

Interestingly enough, the aforementioned 21 week process involving 216 steps was recently highlighted by the USDE as a significant accomplishment. Previously, the grant process involved more than 400 steps and took an additional 5 weeks. While the new ''shortened'' process should certainly be applauded, it is a long, long way from satisfactory.

The USDE also recently highlighted additional steps it has taken to make the Department more efficient and more effective. One achievement so noted was a reduction in the paperwork burden imposed by the federal education establishment by 10 percent or 5.4 million hours. However, even with this improvement, 48.6 million hours of paperwork is still required by USDE policies. That amounts to the equivalent of 24,300 employees, working 40 hours per week, for an entire year. Again, the recent improvements are welcomed, but there is a long, long way to go.

The USDE ''studies'' and grant process are just two examples of areas where we must demand a better return on our education dollar. Furthermore, I have no doubt that Chairman Hoekstra and other members of the subcommittee will uncover additional areas ripe for reform as they continue working on the Education at a Crossroads project.

$1,800 FOR EVERY CLASSROOM IN AMERICA

Considering the funding shortfalls many teachers experience, and having identified an enormously large and wasteful bureaucracy, it seems that an important policy initiative would be working to move more dollars directly into classrooms, while spending less on propping up the establishment in Washington. One proposal that would move policy in this direction is the ''Dollars to the Classroom'' resolution, which calls on the USDE to send 90 percent of the money it earmarks for elementary and secondary education directly into classrooms.

While the federal government actually funds a relatively small portion of elementary and secondary education (federal spending represents about six percent of total education spending in this area), it is significant nonetheless. The $5.4 billion currently wasted on bureaucracy could provide a windfall of funds for every classroom in America.

If the federal government sent approximately 90 percent of current federal education dollars directly to the classroom, it would translate into an additional $1,800 for every classroom in America. The impact of such an infusion of resources would be felt immediately by every teacher and every student in every school across the country.

An additional $1,800 for every teacher to use provides a number of possibilities for improving the quality of education:

$200 purchases a microscope, and a child can see a double helix strand of DNA.

$70 purchases a sling psychrometer, which students could use to measure the relative humidity and predict the weather.

A mere $10 obtains flash cards, allowing students to practice time tables with a friend.

$50 buys a globe or a set of maps, allowing children to improve their geography and their knowledge of nations across the seas.

And $1,500 buys a computer with enough desktop space, RAM, and Internet access to allow every student in the classroom to experience the vast amount of educational information available at his or her fingertips.

In some cases, that new found money may be the difference between new textbooks and continuing to use those from the early 1970s. Without a doubt, placing $1,800 at the disposal of a creative and hardworking teacher can and will make a substantial difference for our children, their education, and their futures.

Teachers and superintendents agree that the ''resource gap'' in the classroom must be narrowed. At a recent Education at the Crossroads hearing in Washington, Helen Martin, a high school science teacher from Uninoville, Pennsylvania told legislators:

''It is very frustrating to see so much tax money go to Washington for education and not see funds in the classroom that have been appropriated for education. Please return more education tax dollars directly to the students of our nation who will become the scientitis, business people and lawmakers of the 21st century.''

Dr. Linda Schrenko, the state Superintendent of Schools in Georgia has noted:

''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. . . . Less bureaucracy on all levels will allow more dollars to directly reach the students in the classroom.''

This debate is not about what we should do with the federal Department of Education. Instead, it is about bringing accountability to this federal agency in a way that ensures that children, not bureaucrats, are the final winners.

In 1996, while speaking to the nation's governors, the President stated: ''We cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with what we've got now.'' That is something we can all agree on.

Our efforts to move ''Dollars to the Classroom'' will force the Washington bureaucracy to do a better job with the money we are already spending. And through the Education at a Crossroads project, Chairman Hoekstra is working to help identify the programs that are effective at accomplishing this goal, as well as those that are undermining it.

On still another occasion President Clinton added, ''In an age of tightening budgets, we should be spending public funds on teachers and children, not on unnecessary overhead

and bloated bureaucracy.'' Now, if only the message could get through to the money handlers at USDE.

Raising the question ''Where is the money spent?'' is well worth the time it will take to bring this subject to the forefront of debate. For too long, liberals have claimed that increased federal funding is the ultimate problem-solver. Yet, ever-increasing education budgets have demonstrated otherwise, as test scores continue to decline.

House Education and the Workforce Chairman Bill Goodling (R-PA) has noted time and again that we know children are achieving when we invest in programs that help students master basic academics, engage and involve parents, and move dollars into classrooms. These are the activities of local schools, teachers, and parents, not pencil-pushers and bureaucrats in Washington.

Basic academics and more dollars to the classroom are a winning combination. Now, we must ensure the best education possible for the most number of students, and the best way to accomplish that goal is to see that our tax dollars make it right back into the classroom. When federal education dollars seep into the pools of Washington's 40-agency education bureaucracy, the exact opposite happens—millions of students lose out on available funding.

As H.G. Wells said in his famous Outline of History, ''Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.'' No one would disagree with that. And no one would deny that this is a race we must win.

Today, Republicans are launching a number of initiatives designed to help America win that race. The ongoing Education at a Crossroads project continues to illuminate problem areas and success stories in education. The ''Dollars to the Classroom'' resolution will help refocus our efforts on children, not bureaucracies. These Republican projects will help ensure a stronger education system, and a brighter future for every American student.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I think we can all agree on the importance of sending the majority of education dollars to the classroom, but in fact this resolution does not ask for that. This resolution asks that 95 percent of the program dollars go to the classroom, and in fact that is already what is happening. But having said that we all feel that the majority of education dollars should go to the classroom so that children can receive a quality education, I have to stipulate that I do not agree with the rationale and the myths outlined in this present resolution that is before us today. I wonder why we are consuming our precious floor debate time on this unnecessary rhetoric instead of considering measures which will truly improve the public education of our children.

I believe this body needs to act upon solutions, not resolutions, in our quest to respond to the educational needs of our children. Playing politics through the consideration of this resolution is not the proper nor justified response to our problems in the education system. Despite the obvious political goals of the majority on this resolution, which is to embarrass the Department of Education, I believe it is necessary to point out some of its obvious mistruths.

Among the many premises of this measure is the statement that 3 years ago less than 60 percent of funds spent on elementary and secondary education was spent on instruction. I do not know how we can confirm the accuracy of that statement when, as we all know, the determination of whether an expense is classified as administrative or instructional varies from one school district to another. Some schools classify teacher aides and professional development as administrative costs while others classify that as instructional. In this instance and in many others throughout the resolution, the claims advocated by the majority clearly have absolutely no basis in fact.

Another misleading premise is that the Department of Education and the program it operates are gobbling up funds for wasteful administrative purposes rather than targeting dollars for the classroom. This conclusion is misleading and was never proven by the majority during the committee consideration of this legislation. Nearly all major education programs, and that is what we are really talking about, is the programs, include a 5 percent cap on funds that may be used by State and local educators for administrative purposes. The statutory limits contained in our federal election laws specifically ensure that the funds we provide are going to benefit our Nation's students, not the bureaucracies the majority claims. The limited administrative costs that do exist focus in large part on accountability and quality improvements, and that is something that we should all be concerned with. Additionally, nearly all States are presently taking advantage of a new provision in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which permits a single consolidated application for many Federal grant programs.

Mr. Speaker, rather than wasting time debating a resolution designed to undermine public education, we should adopt instead a positive approach to educational progress, one that emphasizes how the Federal Government can assist local school reform or help prepare crumbling schools that they are now in desperate need of. These are the solutions, not resolutions, I was referring to earlier.

The Democratic caucus I believe has adopted an education agenda that will truly help ensure a quality education for our Nation's children and respond to the needs of our public education system. This agenda emphasizes early childhood development, well-trained teachers, relief for crumbling and overcrowded schools through the rebuilding of our Nation's educational infrastructure, support for local plans to renew neighborhood public schools and coordination of an efficient use of existing resources. The Democratic agenda will ensure that every child will be ready to learn to read by the time they enter kindergarten and bring down student-to-teacher ratios and provide quality instruction and assist schools to wire the classrooms to the Internet plus support local schools' renewal plans that are developed by stakeholders in our communities' public school system, and encourage States to adopt rigorous standards of academic performance. These are actual solutions to the problems we encounter in our educational system. These are what we should be debating, not meaningless politically minded resolutions.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I find it ironic that the one instance in which the majority decides to work together in a bipartisan manner is on a measure that does nothing to respond to the Nation's educational needs. I challenge my Republican colleagues to work together in a bipartisan fashion to address those tangible issues which I previously outlined that will truly help our Nation's children. Everyone in this body needs to remember, we need to provide solutions, not resolutions.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say that after 35 years of Democrat control, their resolutions and their legislation was well-intended. Unfortunately, it struck out.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. EMERSON].

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support House Resolution 139, the dollars to the classroom resolution. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS], the sponsor; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the Committee on Education and the Workforce for their continual hard work to ensure that real reform occurs in our Nation's education system.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would simply set a goal that at least 90 percent of Federal elementary and secondary education dollars reach the classroom. It is currently estimated that only 65 percent of all Federal funds actually reach our Nation's classrooms. This town is notorious for talking about reforming this education system, but this dismal statistic proves that nothing has been accomplished.

The dollars to the classroom resolution is a great way to send a message to the administration that we in Congress are prepared to invoke real reform at the Department of Education. Our goal should be an education system where every child can outscore, outperform and outcompete the students of every other Nation in the world. It is time to put our children before bureaucrats. The decision of how our education money is spent needs to be made by local teachers, local administrators and parents, not the Federal Government. It is time that we invest more wisely, and we must spend our education dollars where they can achieve the most, right in the classroom.

This resolution would mean as much as $1,800 would be added to each classroom budget. At Houston Middle School in southern Missouri, where I taught a class last week, $1,800 is the difference between having computers

and much newer books and other much needed learning resources in that classroom. They desperately need it. It is finally time for Congress to take a stand and do what is right for our Nation's children. I urge my colleagues to support the dollars to the classroom resolution.

□ 1230

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Resolution 139, the dollars to the classroom resolution. The resolution, if you take a moment to read it, in its resolve clause, is perfectly admirable and legitimate. It says the House of Representatives urges the Congress and the U.S. Department of Education, the States and local agencies, to determine the extent to which Federal elementary secondary education dollars are currently reaching the classroom and then work toward a goal of at least 90 percent of the funding to be utilized in that way.

I do not believe there is a single Member of the Congress that will argue against such a resolution.

What troubles us and why the Democrats on the Committee on Education and the Workforce all voted against this resolution is because the whereas clauses contain in them absolutely unfounded, unsubstantiated conclusions.

If these conclusions were actually factual, why are they calling upon the Congress and the Federal Government and the States to study this matter? If they have all the facts, that should be it.

But the very fact that they are calling upon the Congress and the Federal Government and the States to look at this and to determine exactly what is reaching the classroom is discounted by the fact that more than half of the whereas clauses contain in them what I consider absolutely fallacious conclusions regarding the subject matter.

I believe that it is intentionally so stated, because it wishes to disparage the idea of Federal funds for education.

I think that we have to look very closely at the whereas clauses and not just be sucked into voting for the resolution because of the resolve clause. I stand here today and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to read this resolution carefully and see if there is any reason to support the whereas clauses.

There is absolutely nothing to indicate in the testimony given to the subcommittee that all of the funding that is intended to go to the classrooms or the school districts are not so being funded. Yet this resolution makes general conclusions that the money is not getting to the schools.

The resolution states although the States receive less than 10 percent of their education funding from the Federal Government, more than 50 percent of their paperwork is associated with those Federal dollars.

That statement is absolutely unsubstantiated. There is no evidence that the States spend 50 percent of their paperwork on Federal programs. So I think that that is an outrageous statement that in itself calls for a negative vote on this resolution.

Furthermore, there is an assault statement on the New York City public school system. The resolution says ''while it is unknown exactly what percentage of Federal education dollars reaches the classroom, a recent audit of New York City public schools found that only 43 percent of their local education budget reaches the classroom.''

There is no evidence to that fact regarding this particular school system. In any event, it is not relevant to this resolution, because all that the resolution is attempting to discuss are Federal dollars, not local and State dollars. So that whereas clause simply is not relevant, as it deals with local funds.

The resolution also states even if 65 percent of the Federal education dollars presently reach the classroom, it still means that billions of dollars are not directly spent on the classroom.

This is absolutely a false statement. Whoever said only 65 percent of Federal education funds reach the classroom? There is already evidence in the record to indicate that between 95 and 98 percent of the funding from the Federal Government actually gets to the local school districts.

We have testimony in our record here, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT], in response to my question said in discussing this matter with others, he thinks ''the average in the country is somewhere between 93 and 98 percent actually getting to the districts.''

So I cannot imagine where there is any truth whatsoever in this statement about 65 percent of the Federal education dollars reaching the classroom.

So on with the rest of the resolution. It makes mention of the Digest of Education Statistics, regarding total money local and State that are spent in elementary secondary schools. This resolution is dealing with only talking about Federal dollars, so let us stick to the subject matter, and not mix apples with oranges.

I believe that there is ample evidence in all the statistics that are available that 93 percent of our Federal dollars are actually reaching the school districts.

The resolution states too much of our Federal education funding is spent on the bureaucracy and too little spent on our Nation's youth.

The U.S. Department of Education has come repeatedly before our committees and stated that only 2 percent of its budget is spent on administrative costs. So the rest of it goes down to the States.

If we mean to incriminate how the States handle their budgets, then that is a matter entirely separate from this resolution. This resolution is only talking about the Federal money. We have been very careful in determining the way in which the funding is to be allocated in terms of all of the programs that we have implemented.

Programs for special education and for other matters are clear in their distinction as to how the funds are to be spent. I think one has to look at the newly developed Coopers & Lybrand accounting package, and the analysis of the Milwaukee school district which shows that 93 percent of all title I funds went to the classroom for instructional support and 90 percent of all title I funds were spent at the school level.

In the State of South Carolina, we had the opportunity to hear from the Superintendent of Education, Barbara Stock Nielsen, who testified on May 8 of this year that the vast majority of Federal dollars do reach the classroom and that it is probably easier to track the Federal dollars than it is the State and local dollars.

Mr. Speaker, given the facts that we know, that we have been presented in the subcommittee, it is clear that the Federal Government is doing an excellent job. Let us not pass a resolution that disparages Federal aid to education with facts stated in the whereas clause that are absolutely unfounded, unsubstantiated, and in many cases totally false.

So I urge my colleagues to vote down this resolution. It may feel good to say you want more money to get to the students and to the classrooms, but I ask you to look at the whereas clauses and see how inconsistent they are and vote down this House Resolution 139.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS] to discuss this.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentlewoman who said there was no evidence or substantiation, let me quote from the testimony that she should have heard when the hearing was held before the committee. A quote from Lisa Graham Keegan, the Arizona State Superintendent, who said Federal funds account for 10 percent of the education funding, but 50 percent of their paperwork burden. Dr. Charles Garris, superintendent of Unionville-Chadds Ford School District, my own district, came and presented testimony, talking about Federal funds only.

He said that even at the local level, after the administrative overhead from the Federal, at the local level, 25 percent of the funds never reach the students that they were intended to serve, and he detailed the expenditure of those funds. Then he had a stack of papers, an application for a Federal grant. He put it down and he said, ''This takes 5 months to apply, and still, after 5 months of applying, going through 216 steps, we don't know whether we will get any. I will not even apply.''

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard that claim, and I wonder when that claim or statement was made, because, more recently, innovations at the Department of Education through programs like Ed-Flex and other waiver initiatives of the Education Department has allowed States and localities to waive statutory and regulatory requirements of several Federal education programs, such as Even-Start, migrant education, Eisenhower Provisional Development Safe and Drug-Free Schools, community programs, innovation education programs, emergency immigrant education, and the Perkins Vocational Education Programs.

Twelve States currently are Ed-Flex States. So if a State wants to apply for that, they have the option to do that. That is still not the problem or the major educational problem that our education system has in its system today, and I do not think this resolution, which has no standing in law, because it is just a resolution, is going to do anything to really alleviate any of those problems.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD].

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Guaranteeing that 90 percent of Federal funds for elementary and secondary schools is spent directly in the classroom is just plain good sense. I cannot imagine why anybody could be against that.

While there is not complete certainty as to the actual percentage of Federal education dollars that reach the classroom, we do have available to us several studies which suggest that well over 30 percent of these funds are eaten up by the Federal and State bureaucracy.

I have been part of the hearings all around the country on the Crossroads to Education. Everywhere we go, we hear from local people that these funds are eaten up by the bureaucracy. I do not think this should be so, Mr. Speaker. I believe that too much of Federal education funding is spent on bureaucracy and not enough on teaching our children.

I believe that we should support this resolution in a bipartisan way, and even the Democrats on our committee may vote against it. I believe most Democrats in this Congress will support this in a bipartisan way, because they know that the people who actually know our children at home should be the people in charge.

I urge support of H.R. 139.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to that.

Look, here comes back the same story. We are comparing apples and oranges when you compare Federal programs and State programs.

The Federal Government has no way of dictating to States what they expend for administration or other paperwork requirements in their own State. The Federal Government does not control that.

The Federal Government does have caps in the Federal Government on how much can be spent on administration. So to say in one breath that the State and Federal governments are guilty of an excessive cost of administration and overhead regarding paperwork is a misstatement, and it is a misleading statement.

Nobody is against as many of the funds as possible going to the classroom. The Federal programs, as outlined by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] have stated that up to 93 percent, and maybe more, in most cases, are going, of Federal dollars, are going to the classroom. The only thing we can control by this resolution is the Federal dollars going to the classroom.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE].

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, in our great State of South Dakota, we have a fine tradition of public education. My children participated in that process. We always believe as a matter of policy that the State and local governments are those where the function and responsibility primarily for education resides, but as a matter of conviction, that to the extent the Federal Government, the taxpayers, are asked for Federal dollars to support education, that those dollars ought to go into the classroom.

My two young girls attend public schools. They are only 2 of the 51 million students in America who may not have the resources and supplies necessary to prepare them for the 21st century, because we are not getting enough of the Federal funding into the classroom.

That is why I support this resolution. With this resolution, it is estimated that each classroom would receive an additional $1,800. In my State of South Dakota we spend approximately $3,500 per student. Another $1,800 could help pay for additional computer software, hooking on to the Internet or books.

I believe in public education. I hope my colleagues in this body will show their support for public education by supporting a resolution which will ensure that we get the very best value for our tax dollar.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, here again, I do not know how many times we are going to say this, but the fact is that the figures that they come up with do not take into account that 93 percent of the elementary and secondary education spending is done with local dollars, and it is locally controlled.

What we are talking about in the resolution is an effort to make sure that at least 95 percent of these funds get to the education classroom, and, in the Federal programs, except the moneys they use for the publications that they are allowed to make in the budget that they get which is appropriated by this Congress for those specific purposes, is not used for the programs, and the program money, more than 95 percent, is actually ending up in the classroom.

□ 1245

That is the only thing this Federal Government cannot control. As an average, throughout the United States, only 6 percent of the money that local schools receive in assistance to their budgets is from the Federal Government. Of that, they are getting the majority in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I want to thank the chairman for bringing it to the floor. I listened carefully to the debate. It is still confusing because we all say we want the money to go to the classroom, but I hear debates against that.

We have to have our No. 1 priority to be the classroom, the hands-on, where the teacher knows the child's name, and we have the teaching of the basics, reading, writing, arithmetic.

What I found when I got to Washington, DC, though, about 3 years ago, was a lot of apologists for the bureaucracy, fighting hard every day to keep the Federal buildings full of bureaucrats, when actually we need teachers in the classrooms at home.

This resolution just says 90 percent of our Federal dollars, the money we pay, and gets to the Federal level, goes into the classroom. How can Members argue with that, at a time when people are saying, go back to the basics, we want local control?

I urge a strong vote ''yes'' for this resolution.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is a half-truth. The Education Department already sends at least 95 percent of the major education program money to the States. Only 2 percent is used by the Department for administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how often we have said it in committee, and we are repeating it again on the floor: the U.S. Department of Education spends only 2 percent of the total funding for education on its administration. So I do not understand this accusation of this huge bureaucracy consuming the money that belongs to the classrooms and to the school districts. The statistics are there, the studies have been made, and CRS reports all indicate that the figures given by the U.S. Department of Education are correct, only 2 percent.

I also want to call to the attention of the House that in the various legislation that we have passed we have also stipulated not only limitation on Federal bureaucracy or Federal administrative costs, but we have put caps on the State administrative costs. I have a long list here. I do not know how much time there is.

Let us look at Goals 2000. The maximum percent that the States can spend on administration is 4 percent of their grant. Title I LEA grants, 1 percent of the grant is a cap on State and local educational administrative costs; Even Start, a 5-percent limit; title I migrant, a 1-percent limit; Eisenhower Professional Development, a 5-percent limit; title VI, a 3.75-percent limit; safe and drug-free schools, a 4-percent limit; the vocational basic grants, a 5-percent limit; adult education, a 5-percent limit; IDEA, a 5-percent limit.

So we have been careful in understanding the requirements for administration, but also the need to get the money to the places the legislation intended. In each of these major pieces of legislation, we have carefully not only limited the Federal costs of administration, but we have stipulated a limitation on the amount of moneys the State can spend.

If the States in other programs are spending more money than they should be, that is a State and local matter. So for those people who are arguing State and local control, that that is the best place to regulate education, then we ought not to be talking about how they spend their money for education. If we truly believe in local control, that is a matter which the local people, the local State officials, have to come to grips with. But insofar as the Congress, as far as Federal administration is concerned, I believe we have been absolutely attentive to the needs of the classroom, the school districts, and the children.

There are, of course, some areas where it is not possible for the moneys to go directly to the classroom; such as funds for professional development. This is not a direct classroom benefit; but we are benefiting a teacher who is going on for further education.

I believe that this resolution is simply an attempt to haunt the House and the U.S. Department of Education with all sorts of cobwebs and misguided conclusions, to try to cast an impression that the Federal Government has been a wastrel and has not been attentive to the needs of the students and the needs of our local school districts. This of course is false.

Again, I ask the House to vote down this resolution.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, only some groups that would want the power to reside in Washington, D.C., of wasteful spending would oppose this. Why? They want the power here in River City; the same people who vote against balanced budgets, tax relief, because those are taxes given to spend more money for failed systems.

Let me tell the Members, the studies did not even take into account the time that principals and administrators put into working on the paperwork. We have heard States saying up to 50 percent, 50 percent of their costs, are dealing with Federal paperwork.

Let me give Members an idea. Goals 2000 that my colleagues mention, and say this was a George Bush-Ronald Reagan thing, Goals 2000, look at the number of ''shalls'' and ''wills.'' I am not a lawyer, but I know a ''will'' in a line is more important; the States will do certain things. If they do not comply, it has to override the board. The board then sends the recommendations for Goals 2000.

Think about the group that has to look at that. Then it goes to Sacramento. Think about just all the schools in our districts sending all this in to the superintendent, then sending it to the State and the Governor, and then, guess what? There is a big bureaucracy back here in Washington, DC; we know there are problems with it, so they send paperwork back. That takes dollars away.

My wife is an elementary school principal. She had to attend a class for 1½ weeks just to learn how to write a grant to the Federal Government. That is not even included, the dollars get down there, then they have to look at that. Seven hundred and sixty Federal education programs.

Let us look at this. The President wanted $3 billion for a literacy program. There are 14. What is wrong with saying, let us fund 1 or 2, and get rid of the other 13 or 12 of them? But no, my liberal friends will want to put more money for failed systems and keep the same system going.

Let us look at the results. We are 28th in math and science, last of the 15 industrialized nations in all core courses. Money is the issue, but the money to get down to the classroom, not to the Federal bureaucracy.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the chart to which I made reference, and a letter from Mr. Riley:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, July 14, 1997.

Hon. WILLIAM F. GOODLING,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am responding on behalf of President Clinton to your letters dated May 8, 1997, and June 11, 1997, inviting the President to join in the review and evaluation of Federal education programs currently being conducted by the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. I am forwarding a copy of this letter to those who joined you in writing.

As you know, education is the President's highest priority as he works to help all Americans prepare for the challenges of the 21st century. The President also has a keen interest, dating back to the 1993 National Performance Review, in determining ''what works and what is wasted'' in Federal programs.

I came to Washington to make the changes needed to help improve teaching and learning in America's schools. I think you also know that I share your interest in local control of education, focusing on the basics, supporting parents, and getting the most out of Federal education dollars by making sure they have the most positive and cost-effective impact on American classrooms. These principles are at the core of every elementary and secondary education initiative proposed by the President Clinton, and we remain convinced that they are essential to effective education reform.

Over the last year, various Federal Departments, including the Department of Education, have provided a considerable volume of material to staff of your Committee relative to the list of more than 700 programs, which have been characterized in press events and public statements as ''education'' programs directly impacting elementary and secondary education.

A cursory examination of the Committee's list reveals that its size is primarily due to three factors. First, education, training and outreach are by definition a component of virtually every Federal program activity. For example, educational activities are critical to Department of Agriculture efforts to improve nutrition, Department of Health and Human Services programs to prevent the spread of disease, and Department of Transportation activities to encourage safety in the transportation sector. Second, the Federal government has a strong interest, determined and defined largely by the Congress, in supporting a wide variety of specialized career training and research activities. This includes training FBI agents and air traffic controllers as well as much of the research carried out at the National Institutes of Health. Third, for 130 years the Federal government has played a key role in expanding opportunity and quality at every level of education, a role primarily filled through programs administered by the Department of Education.

Programs in the first two categories were never designed, nor were ever claimed, before the Committee undertook its current review, to improve the quality and performance of our elementary and secondary schools. Programs in the third category include a significant number of activities that support postsecondary education, in addition to elementary and secondary education. According to our review of the Committee list, this leaves less than one quarter of the programs identified by the Committee that actually deliver dollars aimed at improving elementary and secondary education.

The Department's item-by-item review of the Committee's list is enclosed for your information. That review was conducted in consultation with other involved agencies. In short, this review shows that the Committee's tally of ''Federal education programs'' is significantly overstated. Out of the latest total of 788 programs:

183 are no longer authorized or funded;

139 are postsecondary or adult education programs;

71 funds specialized research;

68 provide employment or job-related training and technical assistance;

58 are for the education and training of health professionals;

47 provide public information or community outreach;

27 support the arts, museums, or historic preservation;

26 provide various services to individuals;

16 fund construction projects, community development, and community service; and

11 are nutrition programs.

The remaining 142 Federal programs that support elementary and secondary education, include noninstructional activities like the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports, as well as educational outreach activities related to specific agency missions, such as training science teachers through the Department of Energy and Aviation Education at the Department of Transportation.

Focusing just on the 305 programs identified as Department of Education programs, 122 are unauthorized, unfunded or simply not programs. That leaves 183 Department of Education programs covering pre-K through postgraduate education and training, of which 102 programs impact elementary and secondary education.

Despite these sharply reduced numbers of what can realistically be characterized as ''elementary and secondary education programs,'' the entire list of 788 programs has been cited as proof of (1) wasteful and inefficient duplication in Federal programs, (2) an excessive and costly Federal bureaucracy, and (3) burdensome regulatory and paperwork requirements on schools and teachers. In reality, the Clinton Administration working with Congress has an impressive record on all three counts:

Beginning with the 1993 National Performance Review, the Clinton Administration has taken the lead in eliminating unnecessary or ineffective programs and consolidating duplicative activities. Through fiscal year 1997 the Department proposed the elimination, phase-out, or consolidation of more than 100 programs, while Congress has agreed to eliminate 64 programs totaling $625 million. Even with the addition of new programs, the total administered by the Department fell from 240 in 1995 to under 200 in 1997. The recently signed reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act included program consolidations that will reduce that number even further. In addition, the President's 1998 budget request included 10 more program terminations, and his proposed reauthorization of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act would reduce the number of authorized vocational education programs from 23 to 3.

The Clinton Administration has reduced the number of Federal employees to levels not seen since the Kennedy Administration. The Department of Education has actually seen its workforce fall by nearly 40 percent since 1980. In fact, the Department today employs over 3,000 fewer individuals than its predecessor agencies. Partly as a result of this decline, the Department administers more dollars per employee than any other Cabinet-level agency, and delivers 98 cents of every appropriated dollar to States, schools, and students.

No President has done more to reduce regulatory burden, cut paperwork, and enhance local control of our elementary and secondary schools. Under President Clinton's regulatory reinvention initiative, the Department has eliminated nearly 40 percent of its regulations. The Department also has greatly expanded waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements that stood in the way of better teaching and learning, including allowing State-level officials in 11 States broad authority to waive Federal requirements as part of the ED-FLEX demonstration. Consolidated applications and reduced reporting requirements have helped to reduce the paperwork burden on applicants for Department programs by over 10 percent. We are also cutting paperwork by conducting more business over the Department's site on the World Wide Web, which is currently visited about 5 million times each month. Finally, no Federal program provides more flexible support for locally-based education reform efforts than the Goals 2000 program, for which no regulations were promulgated.

The President and I share your determination to eliminate unnecessary programs in order to devote the maximum Federal resources to those activities that make a real difference in improving teaching and learning in the classroom. The American people expect us to work together to help prepare their children for tomorrow's challenges. As we work on reauthorizations, including the upcoming Higher Education Reauthorization, the Department wants to continue to work on a bipartisan basis to remove obsolete programs from Federal statute as we have done in other legislation over the last several years.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD W. RILEY,
Secretary.

Enclosure.

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS FOR FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS

[Dollars in millions]

Program	1997 Appro.	Max percent for admin.	Amount for admin.
Goals 2000	$476	4.00	$19.0
Title I LEA Grants	7,194	1.00	71.9
Even Start	102	[1] 5.00	5.1
Title I Migrant	305	1.00	3.1
Title I N&D	39	1.00	0.4
Eisenhower Prof. Dev.	310	[1] 5.00	15.5
Title VI	310	3.75	11.6
Safe & Drug-Free/SEAs	415	4.00	16.6
Save & Drug-Free/Governors	104	5.00	5.2
Voc. Ed. (Basic Grants, Tech-Prep)	1,110	5.00	55.5
Adult Education	340	5.00	17.0
IDEA State Grants	3,108	5.00	165.4
IDEA Preschool	360	5.00	18.0
IDEA Infants & Families	318	([2])	([3])
Total (not including IDEA Infants)	14,173	2.70	382.7
Total, ESEA programs	9,255	1.40	129.6

[1] Authorization allows funds set aside at the State level to be used for technical assistance or other activities in addition to State administration.

[2] No limit.

[3] Unknown.

Note.—In all cases, the percentages shown are the maximum amounts that States can use for administration. Some States will use smaller amounts for some programs. On the other hand, the maximum amount for a few programs is actually slightly higher than what is shown because the statute allows States to reserve X% or $Y, whichever is greater; this will have only a minimal impact on the overall totals, but allows the smallest States to use, for administration, a portion significantly greater than the national averages.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me, and congratulate him on all the fine work we have done on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and also for really allowing our subcommittee to travel around the country over the last year and hear what is going on in education and the impact that the Federal Government is having.

Let us take a brief look at exactly what this resolution is calling for. Number one, it asks to determine the extent to which the Federal elementary and secondary education dollars are currently reaching the classroom. It invites us to work together to remove the barriers that currently prevent a greater percentage of funds from reaching the classroom, from reaching our kids, and then work toward a goal of getting 90 cents of every Federal education dollar into the classroom. It simply states we should return a greater percentage of our Federal dollars back to the classroom, and that this is the most effective place and this is the place where we can have most of the leverage with our kids.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is confident that we are doing a good job here in Washington. I wish she could have been with us more often as we went around the country and have visited 14 different States, have had hearings here in Washington, and there is a consistent message, whether it is Milwaukee, New York, Chicago, California, Phoenix, Wilmington, Georgia, Cincinnati, Louisville, Little Rock, Cleveland, Muskegon, Michigan. All of these people are telling us one consistent thing: paperwork, bureaucracy, and mandates from Washington are smothering creativity and effectiveness at the local level. They are not saying everything is fine, they are saying, we are being smothered by the paperwork. People at the State legislature are saying, we are being smothered by mandates that we need to pass on to the local school districts.

No, when we take a look at it from a State level, when we take a look at it from a local level, no, everything is not fine with education and with Federal education dollars. We need more local parental control, we need a focus on more basic academics, and we need to get more dollars to the classroom.

Instead of looking at the local level, I am disappointed that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] does not agree with our President. Our President recognizes that everything is not fine. In 1996, as we were moving out and spending more money on education, what did our President say? ''We cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we've got now.''

The President recognizes we need to get more dollars into the classroom, the people at the local level recognize we need to get more money to the classroom. It is only a few here in the House of Representatives that believe that everything is fine and we do not need to change anything. No, we have a lot of work to do. We need to move forward. When we are getting somewhere between 50 to 65 cents of Federal dollars into the classroom, we know we can do better.

What are people saying? Dr. Yvonne Chan, from a great charter school we visited in California, said ''Don't swamp us with the paperwork and we can have a lot more money going to the kids.'' This is a woman who saved $1 million out of her State budget and they are focusing it on the kids, and

they are doing wonderful things in that charter school in that State.

We have seen that around the country, States freeing up administrators, States freeing up teachers at the local level to focus on what needs to be done in the classroom. It is about time Washington decides that is the best place to go, that we start agreeing with the movements that are going on around the States to less mandates, more flexibility at the local level, and more dollars to the classroom.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As quickly as I can, Mr. Speaker, at least 95 percent of the Federal dollars are reaching the classroom, Federal dollars I am talking about, for Federal programs. They reach the classroom. The paperwork from Washington is not what is inundating the local school districts. If we look at the State of Kansas, it has less than an inch of paperwork regulations. If we look at the State of California, it is about 17 inches of paper regulations. That is what these people are complaining about. But when we ask the question wrong, we are going to get the answer wrong.

This is not about power. My friend, the gentleman from California, Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM, says that we are hungry for power up here. I have never felt that power up here. It is not about power, it is about States' rights.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT].

(Mr. BLUNT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, the question today is, should we send more dollars to the classroom? This does not seem like it would be a tough question, but it is a question that we are struggling with on the House floor today.

□ 1300

Who knows your child's name better? A teacher who knows that child or a bureaucrat in the beltway in Washington or even in the State capital?

Our opponents on this issue say that we are already meeting the 90 percent standard. Well, if that is true, let us pass this resolution and ensure that we meet this standard in the future. But we have studies that suggest that we are meeting a 65 percent standard. The difference in the 65 percent standard and a 90 percent standard is about $1,800 for every classroom in America. Every elementary school principal, every secondary school principal can count the number of rooms in their building, multiply that by $1,800; that is the difference in what we are talking about here today.

Mr. Speaker, this is the difference in whether we buy microscopes or not; whether we buy computers or not; whether a classroom has an overhead projector or not; whether there are chemicals for the chemical lab or tools for the shop. And Dollars to the Classroom can increase teachers' salaries, rather than create another form for teachers to fill out.

Dollars to the Classroom is more accountable to the taxpayer because it would ensure for the first time by passing this resolution that, in fact, 90 percent of all funds earmarked for elementary and secondary programs get to the classroom. By doing this, we start the process of setting a new standard, the standard that says that Federal dollars that are appropriated here for education programs really need to get to where kids and teachers are.

We have heard today about that study in the New York City school system that says that 43 percent of money in that district is spent on education; 43 percent is not good enough. Throwing dollars at education will not solve this problem. It is a worn out solution. We need to continue to work toward new solutions.

The new solution we are advancing today is to get the money in the hands of teachers, get the money to classrooms, short circuit any bureaucracy, whether it is bureaucracy in Washington, in State capitals, or even at the local administrative level.

School superintendents and administrators support this concept. Teachers support this concept. Today, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this concept. This bill is different because it sends dollars directly to the classroom where solutions can be found. I urge my colleagues to support this new strategy that puts our children first.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Resolution 139—the dollars to the classroom resolution—I want to express my strong support for this measure and ask my colleagues for their support as well.

With the passage of this measure, the Congress has a tremendous opportunity to send a strong message on how to improve our public education structure. The resolution states that at least 90 percent of Federal funds for elementary and secondary education should be spent in classrooms.

We all agree that the public education system is in disarray. We can improve our schools by providing them with the resources they need to make their classrooms better, safer places to learn. House Resolution 139 does just that. The best thing Washington can do to better educate our children is to send more responsibility and funding back to the local communities and schools who know the needs of these children best.

For too long, the Government has taken a view that bureaucrats in Washington, DC, know what is best for the children in my State of California. How can that be true if California's education needs vary significantly within our State, let alone compared to other States? Who would try to argue that schools in rural Mariposa County have the same needs as schools in inner-city Los Angeles? Probably someone at the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer continue to build a one-size-fits-all education agenda. I was sent to this Congress to represent the people and the families of California's Central Valley. I believe part of this representation includes giving my constituents the resources they need to ensure that our children have the best education possible. House Resolution 139 sends that important message.

As we head into the 21st century, it is important that the Federal Government work with States and local communities by giving them more flexibility and decisionmaking power to shape the policies that are so crucial to our children's education. House Resolution 139 is an important step in that direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 139, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974 AMENDMENTS

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1227) to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to clarify treatment of investment managers under such title.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1227

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INVESTMENT MANAGERS UNDER ERISA TO INCLUDE FIDUCIARIES REGISTERED SOLELY UNDER STATE LAW ONLY IF FEDERAL REGISTRATION PROHIBITED UNDER RECENTLY ENACTED PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3(38)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1002(38)(B)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (iii) and (iv), respectively; and

(2) by striking ''who is'' and all that follows through clause (i) and inserting the following: ''who (i) is registered as an investment adviser under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940; (ii) is not registered as an investment adviser under such Act by reason of paragraph (1) of section 203A(a) of such Act, is registered as an investment adviser under the laws of the State (referred to in such paragraph (1)) in which it maintains its principal office and place of business, and, at the time the fiduciary last filed the registration form most recently filed by the fiduciary with such State in order to maintain the fiduciary's registration under the laws of such State, also filed a copy of such form with the Secretary;''.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS VIA FILING DEPOSITORY.—A fiduciary shall be treated as meeting the requirements of section 3(38)(B)(ii) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (as amended by subsection (a)) relating to provision to the Secretary of Labor of a copy of the form referred to therein, if a copy of such form (or substantially similar information) is available to the Secretary of Labor from a centralized electronic or other record-keeping database.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on