

than 50 cents on the dollar gets down to the classroom because of the bureaucracies. Let me go through to be specific.

In the previous Congress, I was chairman of a subcommittee on education, K through 12 education, basically. There was a direct lending program, a government program to where student loans emanated out of the government.

The GAO did a study and in their report said that it cost, this was capped at 10 percent, only 10 percent of government loans. It cost a billion dollars annually, billion, not million, to run the program. It cost 5 million to collect it, because the government did not have the agencies to go out and collect it. So what we wanted to do is privatize it and cut those losses.

□ 2015

We did that.

In the balanced budget, the President wanted \$3 billion for a new literacy program. California is 50th in literacy. Much to do, I think, because we have a lot of immigrants that come to California and the border States. But it was 50th in literacy. So when the President announced \$3 billion for a new literacy program, it sounded pretty good, until we took a look.

There are 14 literacy programs in the Department of Education. Fourteen of them. What is wrong with taking one or two of those, Mr. Speaker? And when we have an authorization, we may authorize this much, but when it comes time for the dollars we may only authorize and appropriate this many dollars? What is wrong with picking one or two of those and not just fully funding them but actually increasing them?

Title I is one of those that is underfunded by the Federal Government. We could get rid of the bureaucrats, because every one of those programs has bureaucrats that have a salary and retirement. That comes out of the education funds. They have a building here in Washington that we pay rent on. The paperwork that they generate takes dollars away from the classroom.

There are 760 Federal education programs, Mr. Speaker, which allow us to get less than 50 cents on a dollar down to the classroom. What we want to do is get 90 or 95 percent of the dollars down to the classroom so that the teachers, the parents, the community and the administrators can make the decisions for their children instead of the bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C.

I had a hearing and we had eight different areas testifying. They all had the greatest programs since sliced bread. At the end of the hearing I asked which of them had any one of the other seven's programs. None of them. I said, that is the whole idea. Everyone likes their own programs.

We want to give them each a block grant, instead of mandating all the other seven programs in all the other districts, in which there are only min-

uscule dollars then to run the programs that they like. We could give them a block grant, and they could pick the program that is good for them, because Wisconsin may be a lot different than San Diego, California, or Hoboken, or wherever it happens to be.

Washington, D.C. My colleagues talk about school construction. Washington has some of the worst schools in this Nation. Over 70 percent of the children graduate functionally illiterate. The school houses were falling apart; their roofs caving in. School was canceled. Fire codes were not met. Schools did not start timely last year because of construction. The average age is over 60 years.

We wanted to waive Davis-Bacon requirements, which is the prevailing wage or union wage, to construct those schools. And my colleagues said, oh, they are for the children.

Well, we could have saved \$24 million to build new schools in D.C. on that limited budget, because it cost 35 percent, Mr. Speaker, by going to union wage. We could have saved \$24 million that would have gone to build those Washington, D.C., schools and repair those roofs. But did our colleagues choose the children? No, they chose their precious union, because it finances their campaigns. Watch the media if anyone has any doubt about that.

Mr. Speaker, we had the Individuals with Disabilities Act; special education. It had never been fully funded, and the Republicans funded that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and I worked and put the two factions of the schools and the parents together, with no food or water, until they came out of the room and, finally, we came up with something fairly good. There are still problems, but we funded it up toward the 40 percent level.

Impact aid. The President totally cut out impact aid, education aid for military and Indian reservations.

We have done a lot, Mr. Speaker.

FUNDING EDUCATION IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join the chorus of those who to want discuss education.

It is interesting, we have had a lot of discussion from the White House, we have had a lot of criticism from Democrats about the process that we are going through on education. Is it political rhetoric? Is it a serious commitment to helping our local schools across America? That is the question I want to ask, Mr. Speaker.

We have those who want to start school construction programs in the Federal Government.

First, I would like to state that Federal money is not simple to use. I come from a rural part of Pennsylvania, where many school districts obtain very few Federal dollars because they need consultants, they need people who understand the Federal programs, and they have to work for months and sometimes years to get into the system and figure out the language the bureaucrats in their State capital want and the bureaucrats in Washington demand. So most small rural school districts do not receive much Federal money because they do not have consultants, they do not have grantsmen, they do not have the people that speak the right language that bureaucrats understand.

Now we are going to Federalize school construction. We have 15,600 schools across America, approximately. The school construction program proposed by the President will take half the money and will give it to 100 urban poor schools. That leaves 15,500 some school districts with no funding. Now they will have a chance at the other half, but urban poor districts are not prohibited from going after that.

And this is a program for all of America? I do not think so. This is a program to go to President Clinton's base in the urban parts of America.

Now urban poor school districts have problems, but so do rural poor school districts, and they should have an equal shot. The construction program that has been designed by the President will not be a program that will help many schools in this country. The vast majority of the schools will never see a dollar. And those that choose to use this will lengthen the process of constructing schools by a year or two.

I have never seen a Federal program that even worked the first year. Last year, we had the technology program, had a half billion dollars in it. They have spent less than 100 million so far, and the year is over. Because Federal bureaucrats cannot make programs work in 1 year's time.

This will delay construction in America. This will make it more complicated to construct schools in America. It will make it more costly to construct schools in America because of the Federal bureaucracies that will have to be met, and Davis-Bacon, which will raise the cost of construction itself.

Then we have the program of teachers in the classroom, 100,000 teachers. That is a good cause. I think most of us would like to see 100,000 additional teachers. Probably 40 or 50 school districts in America will receive some kind of grant to do that or maybe 100, at the most, or 150. But that leaves 15,400 or 15,500 school districts with no change. Should we not have programs that get out equally across America where the need is, whether it is urban or whether it is rural or whether it is suburban, if there are school districts in trouble?

We can do that. We could expand the loan forgiveness program and get teachers into low income rural and urban shortage areas, and we could do that overnight. We could fund special ed, would get money into every school district. The ones that would get the most would be those who have the most poor students, the most students that need special education, and we would have the money right where it is most needed. The money they could free up on their own they could use to hire more teachers; they could use to fix their schools.

Vocational education, we have flat-funded vocational technical education year after year. This President again flat-funded it this year, or recommended flat funding. We are passing legislation to allow more immigrants to fill the technology jobs because we do not have an educational system that is training them, and it all starts in vocational education.

Most recently, we passed in the House, it did not get action in the Senate yet, a Dollars to the Classroom program that combines 31 programs and puts the money directly back into school districts. That frees up \$700 million to \$800 million without raising taxes because it does away with Federal bureaucrats, it does away with State bureaucrats, and it puts the money in the classroom where they can hire teachers or where they can improve the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the President's goal to help education is honorable, but I think the direction he has taken is election year politics because it is a new program that he can put his name on.

I want to say, new Federal programs do not work; 1999 will not see a school constructed, 1999 will not see more teachers in the classroom, because these programs cannot work in one year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe if we are going to increase funding for education I would support that. Let us fund vocational education. Let us fund special education. Let us fund loan forgiveness for low income rural and urban shortage areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get the money out where it can work, not in some new ideas created by the White House that will not work and will not help our schools across America. It will only help a few.

CREATING NEW OLD PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, during the morning hour this morning, I asked the question, why all of the political rhetoric in the last week about education?

Make no mistake, everyone back home knows it is political rhetoric. So

why all of the political rhetoric on education in the last week?

There were those who said we need a day's debate on education. The 105th Congress, the real education record, we have had 30 days of debate on the Floor of the House about education, passed 25 major accomplishments in the area of education and job training. So why all the rhetoric?

I think there are four reasons probably. First, it is a diversionary tactic. Now, I suppose I can understand that, divert the attention from anything else, but I hate to see children used as part of that diversionary tactic.

Secondly, of course, the polls say education is a sexy issue, and so that is the thing we should talk about: education. Now, I hope my colleagues are very careful, because those very same polls say that we, the American people, distrust most of all the Federal Government's involvement in elementary-secondary education.

The American public distrusts the Federal Government's involvement in elementary-secondary education. They also distrust the States' involvement. They believe that their local elected officials, their school board members, their superintendents, their teachers, their principals and their parents know best on the local level how to bring about reform so that all will have a quality elementary-secondary education.

Then I think there is a third reason. I have always suspected from day one that this administration wants to micromanage elementary-secondary education, micromanage from D.C. It has never worked in the past, will not work now, will not work in the future, but it is certainly a goal and, again, the American public does not want that micromanagement of their elementary-secondary schools from Washington, D.C.

Fourth, and probably the major reason, pride of authorship. Every president wants a legacy and every president recently seems to want that legacy to be in the area of education. So new old programs have to be created. I say new old programs because most every program is on the book already. Just give it a new title, a new name, and somehow or another it is yours.

As I said to the White House last week, it does not matter who gets credit, as long as we are trying to provide a quality education for all students.

Let me give a good example of how all of the rhetoric about school maintenance and school building, all the rhetoric about 100,000 new teachers, can be solved by using an existing program. If someone really believes there is an elementary teacher shortage, they apparently do not spend very much time studying statistics.

There are about 150,000 elementary teachers now certified who cannot find a teaching job, and they are working in department stores, fast food restaurants, offices. In my district, depending on the school district, there

are anywhere from 50 to 200 applicants for an elementary teaching job, for every opening.

□ 2030

So what is the problem? Well, the problem is that they will not go where they are most needed, or, because of discipline problems, they give up after a short while. So in the higher education bill we did something about that. We said we will give you some loan forgiveness if you will go to center-city and teach, if you will go to rural America and teach.

I do not know how to deal with the discipline problem from the Federal level. I suppose we could send the toughest Marine we have, one to every classroom. That would not be of any value whatsoever, because they would not be allowed to discipline anyway, so it would be a waste of money.

You see, unless parents are going to discipline, there is nothing that can be done, because the public has said the school may not discipline. So I do not know how to solve that problem. But if you were to fully fund special education, let me just show you what it means in several districts.

In my district, the City of York has 49,000 people. Thirty years ago the former majority mandated, mandated, 100 percent of everything that a local school district must do in the area of special education. One hundred percent. And they were very generous. They said however, we will not send you 100 percent of the funds to do that. What they said is, we will send you 40 percent of the excess cost, 40 percent of what it costs more to educate a special needs youngster than it does to educate a regular student. Forty percent of that excess cost.

Now, in the City of York, 49,000 people, they spend \$6 million on special education; \$6 million on a 100 percent mandate from the Federal level. They have to raise almost \$4 million of that locally, a very difficult chore if you realize the tax base they have to work with.

If we would fund the 40 percent that was promised 30 years ago, they would have more than \$1 million extra every year, to reduce class size, to hire extra teachers if they need extra teachers, to repair buildings, to do everything that somebody else says we need some special program in order to do that.

Let me give you a couple of others. The special school district of St. Louis, they spend \$170 million each year to fund the 100 percent mandate from Washington, D.C. for special education. \$170 million. They have to raise \$127 million of that locally. Locally. If we were to send them their 40 percent that was promised, they would get an additional \$24 million to maintain their buildings, to build new buildings, to reduce class size, to do everything that they believe is necessary to provide a quality education for all.

If you went to West Contra Costa Unified District in California, they