



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1998

No. 125

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 18, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable JO ANN EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Teach us, gracious God, to use our words as symbols of truth and peace, and not as arrows of vengeance; remind us to use our thoughts as reservoirs of wisdom, and not as arenas of suspicion; instruct our minds to harbor thoughts of reconciliation and understanding, and not to hold rancor or resentment; train our hands to work together to demonstrate the unity of purpose and the solidarity of appreciation that binds us together. As You have created us in Your image, O God, so unite us in the bonds of respect one for the other. May the good feelings of our hearts find resonance with our words and may all our good words find relevance in our daily lives. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CHAMBLISS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2281. An act to amend title 17, United States Code, to implement the World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty and Performances and Phonograms Treaty, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3874. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with increased access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations and improve program management, to extend certain authorities contained in those Acts through fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2281) "An Act to amend title 17, United States Code, to implement the World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty and Performances and Phonograms Treaty, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATCH, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. LEAHY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3874) "an Act to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide children with increased access to food and nutrition assistance, to simplify program operations and improve program management, to extend certain authorities contained in those Acts through fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LUGAR, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. LEAHY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1770. An act to elevate the position of Director of the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services to Assistant Secretary for Indian Health, and for other purposes.

S. 1998. An act to authorize an interpretive center and related visitor facilities within the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park, and for other purposes.

S. 2193. An act to implement the provisions of the Trademark Law Treaty.

S. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in support of the recommendations of the International Commission of Jurists on Tibet and on United States policy with regard to Tibet.

DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Pursuant to House Resolution 543 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3248.

□ 0902

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H8037

House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3248) to provide Dollars to the Classroom, with Mrs. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, it was last evening when I indicated that I would try to be as kind as I could to the Department of Education and as kind as I could to the lobbyists for the chief school administrators, but it is very difficult to be kind with my words when it is very obvious that they knew exactly what they were doing when they sent erroneous material to Members of the Congress. They knew very well that what they were talking about was an appropriation bill. We are not talking about an appropriation bill today. We, as a matter of fact, are talking about Dollars to the Classroom.

It does not take a rocket scientist to realize that if the appropriators reduce spending in any category, less money will be available. But this has nothing to do with that. No matter what the appropriators do, we, with Dollars to the Classroom, will send more money to the classroom. No matter what, as I said, the appropriators would do.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) has labored long and hard for 2 years to bring this legislation to us. And I want to point out before anybody gets up and says our State would lose money, that they are wrong. Let me pick off some States, and those in the committee will know which States I am choosing, since they sit to my right, one, two, three, four, five, six, down the line.

Missouri. Missouri gets \$8 million more in Dollars to the Classroom. California gets \$25 million more in Dollars to the Classroom. New Jersey gets \$12 million more. Michigan gets \$17 million more. New York, \$13 million more. Indiana, \$5.5 million more. Hawaii, about \$2 million more. All those States gain, not lose, with Dollars to the Classroom.

I can understand why the bureaucracy and those who represent bureaucracies are trying to derail the program. They want to save the bureaucracies. They apparently do not care whether money gets to teachers and to children. They apparently are only concerned about having the bureaucracy in Washington and having the bureaucracy back in the States. Well, that does not help improve education in the United States. And that additional money to each of those States that I mentioned, and all other States, means that every school will get \$9,300 more and every

classroom will get \$425 more. And that is from the Congressional Research Service, not from me.

We have 760 programs across 40 bureaucracies at the present time. Do my colleagues realize it takes teachers and administrators 48 million hours a year to complete the paperwork required by the Federal Government, or the equivalent of 25,000 teachers working 40 hours per week for a full year just to cut through the red tape? Not one penny to a child. What a tragedy.

Well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and our committee have before us today an opportunity to get the money down to the children, 95 percent down into the classroom where the teacher and the children and the administrators and the parents can make a true effort to bring about the necessary reform in order to make sure that all receive a quality education in the United States.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to yield time?

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I do not want to end up finding that we have yielded all the time and then have no time to refute all the misstatements that may be made later on. And I am sure they will be made.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for bringing this reform to the floor.

Before I go into the specifics of this bill, let me just cover some charts here. This is a \$2.74 billion bill that directs money to the classrooms, to the parents, the teachers, and the children of this Nation. And what I am looking forward to is delivering this check. Every Member of the House will have an opportunity to go to their districts and give a check to their children, to their teachers, to their parents, similar to this for the 16th Congressional District. This money can be used the way they want to spend it, and this is additional money under the existing appropriations level. This is the kind of money that is being freed up due to elimination of the administrative requirements that are presently required that eat up about 35 percent of Federal education tax dollars.

Let me just briefly describe the bill. What the bill does is consolidate 31 Federal programs and, instead of those Federal programs, as this chart shows, being siphoned off at every level, the Federal level, the State level, instead of money being used for agencies and assistance centers and private organizations, administrative cost, paperwork, the money will be a single stream from the U.S. Federal Department of Education down to the local school districts. This means a tremendous savings, with more flexibility, more money, and more local control.

Every State is held harmless 100 percent. There is an inflationary provision

in the bill. And the result is the children of this Nation are going to win. Whatever the local teachers and parents decide is their need in spending education tax dollars, they can spend that money. And it might be spending money to make smaller class sizes, it might be for computers hooking up to the internet, microscopes, maps, globes, teachers' salaries, aids, equipment, books, supplies, whatever their priorities are is what they can use the money for.

And so, Madam Chairman, I am very pleased that organizations like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are saying this is going to be a key vote in how they rate Members.

I think it really comes down to this: Who do we trust with our tax dollars? Our local teachers, our local educators, our local parents, or the bureaucracy, the Federal bureaucracy? I cast my vote for our children, our teachers, our parents on the local level.

Support the Dollars to the Classroom Act.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3248, the Dollars to the Classroom Act. This legislation converts 31 targeted popular, effective elementary and secondary education programs into a block grant to the States. The replaced programs include Eisenhower Professional Development, the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, Goals 2000, School to Work, Comprehensive School Reform, and even Close-Up. This is the only attempt by the majority to address education reform during the 105th Congress, and it relies on a measure that removes accountability, eliminates targeting to the neediest children, and promotes reduction in education spending.

H.R. 3248 abandons the Federal commitment to target education dollars to the neediest children in America. Currently, the Federal Government targets education funds to impoverished areas at seven times the rate of State and local efforts. H.R. 3248 repeals this targeting and allows Governors and States to divert limited resources away from needy schools and students.

H.R. 3248 also replaces existing programs that have strong accountability with a blank check to the States, and does not provide the oversight necessary to ensure quality programs. In addition, H.R. 3248 will cause a loss in education funding generally. In 1981, more than 40 education programs were merged into a block grant. Since then, funding for this education block grant has decreased by more than half. We should be enhancing our investment in education not gradually dismantling the Department of Education through budget cuts and block grants.

Finally, H.R. 3248 does nothing to address real education priorities, such as modernizing our public schools, reducing class size, improving reading and reforming our most troubled schools.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, will offer an amendment that represents a key ingredient in education reform. This amendment will substitute the bill with a class size reduction initiative. Support for class size reduction cuts across party lines. In the State of California, the class size initiative was put in place by Governor Wilson. Other State and local officials, including a Republican gubernatorial candidate in the State of Maryland, are looking to class size reduction initiatives to spur education reform.

□ 0915

My colleagues should consider H.R. 3248 for what it is, just one more attempt to do away with the Federal role in education. We should support non-partisan efforts to improve the quality of instruction for children across the Nation. We should help local schools address education reform at its most basic level, the size of the class and the quality of the instruction.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in rejecting legislation that dismantles viable, important education programs and support class size reduction substitute of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I would like to point out to the gentleman who just spoke that as a matter of fact Illinois will receive an additional \$15,960,940. That is Illinois that will receive that additional \$16 million. I would also remind the speaker that we do not abandon a commitment to children. We abandon the commitment to bureaucrats. We are intending to make very, very sure that it is children we focus on. I also would remind him that it does not call for a loss in funding. That loss comes if the appropriators appropriate according to the way they said they are. They will not.

He also indicated that maybe there was a loss in Chapter 2 money. There was—under a Democrat leadership in the House of Representatives. I would remind all of them that there is an increase to Illinois of \$15,960,000 that goes right down to the classroom to help children.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I love it when our chairman, for whom I have a great deal of respect, gets angry about these things and tries to emphasize how we are going to be better off in actuality, and he really believes that. But we on the other side happen to believe differently.

In the first place, this is not really about dollars to the classroom. How do you get more dollars to the classroom when you cut the appropriation by 16 percent? As far as 95 percent to the

classroom, the reality is that all these Federal programs, the administrative cap on them does not exceed 5 percent, anyway.

So what is it really all about? I will tell you. It is really all about block-granting. The block grant concept is the idea of giving flexibility to local jurisdictions. That is fine, too. Except that these programs, in all these 31 programs we are targeting special populations, because locals either for one reason or another, because of budget constraints or because of just no concern for the problem, were neglecting these populations, these special populations. These are national priorities, not local priorities. As a result, we are going to block-grant and give the locals the discretion of how to use the money. Well, that is fine, too, and I could go along with that in certain programs, but in these certain programs where there are special population needs, the problem is that if the local decides that that is not the problem and it is not sufficient and they do not want to address the problem and serve that special population, they are not going to do it.

By the admission of the chairman the other day himself when the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) was complaining about that special population program for native Hawaiians, he said, "Hey, look, in this system that we are setting in place, she could have all the money for that program. She could convince her locals that that is the greatest need and they could get all the money." Therein lies the problem. I do not think that the chairman realizes that that very thing might happen and that special populations where we determine their greatest need are not going to get served.

This bill is a shameful attempt to sabotage the Federal support for education. The bill would destroy a number of popular and effective elementary and secondary programs such as the Eisenhower professional development, Goals 2000, school-to-work, comprehensive school program and technology for education by creating this block grant. Repealing these programs effectively eliminates critical programs designed to enhance professional development for teachers, to develop challenging State standards, to expand employment opportunities and to create innovative educational instruction methods.

H.R. 3248 abandons the Federal commitment to target funds to the neediest of children. The Federal Government targets education funds to poor areas at seven times the rate of State or local efforts. H.R. 3248 repeals targeting and allows governors and States to divert limited resources away from needy schools and students.

H.R. 3248 also eliminates accountability for Federal dollars. While existing programs have strong accountability provisions, this block grant gives the States a blank check and fails to provide oversight necessary to ensure quality programs.

Most importantly, H.R. 3248 will cause a loss in educational funding generally. In every case where there has been a block grant, programs put together in a block grant, subsequent appropriators have appropriated less money for that and the programs get less money to deal with the very vast problems that they have. Past efforts to block-grant programs have led to substantially decreased funding levels in education. We should be enhancing our investment in education, not dismantling the Department of Education through budget cuts and block grants.

Finally, H.R. 3248 does nothing to address the real educational priorities such as modernizing our public schools, reducing class size, improving reading and reforming our most troubled schools.

Madam Chairman, later we will offer a substitute amendment to insert the Democratic plan to reduce class sizes. This initiative would enable school districts across the country to hire 100,000 new teachers and ensure that existing teachers have access to the latest and most successful instructional techniques. The goal of the plan is to reduce the class size in grades 1 through 3 to an average of 18.

We all know that small class size means more individual attention to the students. High quality teachers and smaller classes are the key to enhancing student achievement. Rather than adopting phony education reform through block grants, we should move swiftly to hire new teachers to reduce class sizes so that every child in America has a fair shot of succeeding.

Madam Chairman, in the State of California, Governor Wilson, a Republican governor, put forth a program of reducing class sizes and it has been implemented in California. They have found that in implementing that program that there is a tremendous need, new need for a great number of more teachers. In fact, there was a shortage of teachers before. They are having a difficult time reaching that. Then they find out that aside from needing more teachers, they are going to need more classrooms, they are going to need more equipment, they are going to need better trained teachers in the new technologies and all of this. This program does nothing to enhance any of that and still leaves those States like California who had the initiative to reduce class size in the beginning without the wherewithal to be able to provide for those students.

Madam Chairman, our students have the greatest need. I do not think we ought to be politicizing this thing and getting into theories about what might work, but we ought to be working solidly to provide the needs for these students. If we get up and we mean what we say in our speeches that our children are our future, that our children are the most important thing in our lives, then we ought to be working to help them, not hurt them.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Michigan, I say, aha, we just heard one more time, "You can't trust those local people. You can't trust the State."

We are going to give Pete Wilson \$24,928,828 more to reduce his class size and to prepare his teachers to teach in those classrooms.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), an important member of the committee who will receive in his State an additional \$16,756,290.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, the last time I looked, our school boards were local, they are not Federal. As I look at the decisions that they make, whether it be in curriculum or different programs for the students that they serve in every community, they have a very tough job. They do it very well.

As I look at a number of the programs that have been consolidated, some 31 programs to the tune of a little bit more than \$2.5 billion, this bill that we are taking up today allows them the flexibility to use the dollars as they decide. I visited just about every school district in my district over the last year and visit a school virtually every week. I have seen programs work and I have seen programs that have not worked. One of the programs that works I think terrifically is the math and science program that we have across our district. That program is well under way in many areas across the country. Now that it is under way, in the future, if this bill passes, they can use funds that are already in place for something else.

The gentleman before me spoke about reducing the classroom ratio. They can do that under this bill. That is a very admirable goal. My brother is a public school teacher. As a parent, I know the importance of having a small teacher-student ratio. If that is a priority as it should be under this bill, they can do exactly that.

We do not need a Democratic substitute to this bill that solely does that because it is redundant. It is already included in the bill. This bill allows the flexibility for school boards and staff across the country to make sure that the dollars that they are receiving go to the areas that they want to be a priority. They can mix and match. They can take those funds. They are not cut. The reason why virtually every State is going to receive more money is because this bill allows for that.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I am amazed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle support the Dollars to the Classroom Act. And I am amazed that we hear that the majority of districts will receive more money

when the Congressional Research Service has estimated that 27 out of the 50 States will receive less money in fiscal year 1999 under this legislation than they would have under the existing 31 programs that were funded in fiscal year 1998. In fact, some States will lose as much as 68 percent of their fiscal year 1998 funding.

Now, of course I am delighted that California will receive more in this round of appropriations if this is passed. But we cannot count, with the priorities of this Congress on block granting, supporting increased funding when appropriations is cutting education by 20 percent in this year alone.

It truly appears to me that the majority party, not the minority party—the Republicans, not the Democrats—would tell communities how they should spend their education dollars. Education in America has always been a local issue. We know that. I for one think that is the way it should be. But in the communities that I represent, Marin and Sonoma counties, the two counties just north of San Francisco across the Golden Gate Bridge, it is the parents, the educators and the students who join together with local elected school boards to decide how to spend their education dollars. They do not need Washington, D.C., and they do not need Sacramento to tell them what they need.

In my district, the majority of educators and the majority of education funding is spent in the classroom. But sometimes a community needs to spend funds in other ways, such as teacher training activities, educational technology, coordinated services. It will not matter how much money we spend in the classroom, Madam Chairman, unless we have world class teachers and our children come to school ready to learn. We have always relied on parents, educators, and the local community leaders to make local education decisions.

I urge my colleagues to show their trust in the folks back home by voting against the Dollars to the Classroom Act.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Montana, I would point out once again, California will get an additional \$24,928,828, right to the classroom.

□ 0930

I just heard the gentlewoman say what the Congressional Research Office said. That is totally opposite what the Congressional Research said. Those are manipulated figures from the department that deal with a budget with an appropriation bill. It has nothing to do with the legislation before us. So let us not mix apples and oranges.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), who will receive an additional \$1,868,822 under Dollars to the Classroom to help children.

Mr. HILL. Madam Chairman, if we listen to the debate on the left, we

would think that only bureaucrats in Washington care about the kids, but I can tell my colleagues that there are teachers and parents and school administrators in Montana that care more about the kids in Montana than anyone here in Washington.

The debate here today, Dollars to the Classroom, is a simple debate. It is not a new idea, Madam Chairman; it is about taking dollars from the bureaucracy and giving it to our schools. Cutting the overhead is what we call it in business.

But those who are defending the status quo, the establishment, say that we cannot reform education. They say that we should measure success by how many people we put to work in Washington. They say we should measure success by how many forms we require people to fill out or how many filing cabinets we put them in.

The establishment says that we will measure our success by how much activity we generate. Reformers say, no, that we can measure our success by how well our kids are doing. Our kids can do better and need to do better, and we can do that by trusting local teachers, local school boards and holding schools accountable to their parents.

Sending more dollars to the classroom will begin the process of shifting the emphasis away from Washington to our home towns, to our local schools, and to our kids. I urge my colleagues to support Dollars to the Classroom.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman realizes that under this block grant program, his State would lose 12 percent.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have remaining be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) for a few minutes in my absence.

The CHAIRMAN (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Dollars to the Classroom, which leaves schools with no guarantee that they would actually get any additional dollars.

This bill would distribute education grants based solely on student population, not based on poverty rates, or having a good idea for making a school work, demonstrating success and improving student achievement, or any other criteria. And once the money goes out, we have no way to hold the States accountable for how they spend taxpayer dollars. In fact, there is no accountability that is built into this program.

We need to make sure that all of our American children who attend public schools learn to the high standards, that they have qualified teachers in classrooms who are equipped with up-

to-date materials, and our kids are able to attend school in a safe environment.

This bill would accomplish none of those goals. It would repeal 31 of the most effective education programs on the books. Among the casualties, Eisenhower Professional Development Program. This supports teacher training in math and science. School To Work, which helps young people realize their aspirations and to develop career goals. Safe and Drug Free Schools, which gives parents security in knowing that their child is safe when they are in school. All of that would be gone.

If we are truly serious about improving public education, and we must be serious about improving public education, then we would be talking here today about reducing class size, about putting 100,000 new teachers in grades 1 through 3, not just because of numbers, but because of smaller class size. What it does is it allows for individual attention, it allows for more discipline. It creates better standards.

What we would be doing here today is to say, let us modernize our schools. Let us provide local government with a tax credit that allows them to build schools and new classrooms and to be able to wire their schools up to the Internet to get the new technology that our youngsters need in order that they may succeed for their future. That is what we would be discussing here today, if our goal is to improve our schools and make sure our children learn. This Dollars to the Classroom is spurious, it does not work, it will not work.

Let me just say one more thing. My colleague from Pennsylvania who was in the chair before, and I do not know if this will resume, will talk about those States that are increasing their dollars. Well, my State of Connecticut will lose money, 8.5 percent of dollars, \$2.5 million. In addition to which, what is not being discussed here is that in the overall appropriation bill that the committee just passed, all of these programs are cut back by 20 percent, so that this notion that there are additional dollars going to the classroom is really a false promise.

What we need to do today is to vote "no" on this bill and vote for a Democratic substitute that in fact says, let us improve public schools in this country. Let us give all of our kids the break that they need and the opportunity that they need to succeed for the future.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

I would just note for the previous speaker who is opposing the bill that the CRS, Congressional Research estimates will mean at least \$1.9 million more than under the current law for all school districts in Connecticut, averaging about \$9,300 per school.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), whose school districts in this State would receive at least \$2.3

million more under the Dollars to the Classroom act, averaging again \$9,300 more per school and \$425 per classroom.

Mrs. WILSON. Madam Chairman, I am amazed, amazed at my opponents on the other side of the aisle. The question in this debate and about this bill is who do we trust? Of course the Department of Education in Washington opposes this bill and wants accountability with its reams and reams of paperwork.

I will tell my colleagues who I trust. I trust the teachers and the principals and the school administrators in my hometown to come up with an integrated plan of how we are going to educate our kids. We do not need stovepipes from Washington telling us how to spend those dollars and requiring us to hire administrators to fill out paperwork, to tell bureaucrats in Washington how they spent them. That is wrong.

We can educate our children at the local level, increasing funds to the classroom, and we have seen it work in State government. Get rid of the bureaucrats, and hire the teachers. That is what this bill does, and that is why I am supporting it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

I hope the gentlewoman understands that her State, New Mexico, loses 20 percent under this bill.

They all talk about us on this side wanting to micromanage and tell the locals what to do. Well, on those particular means of those special populations, we are telling them what to do because they were not doing it. But if we want to talk about micromanaging, look at the bill, read the bill. The bill has so many instances where they tell exactly the school districts what to do, that they know best in this bill.

Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This is not about Dollars to the Classroom, this is about eliminating programs that have been created by previous Congresses that target funding to the local communities, local educational systems to the States for specific purposes. Make no mistake about that. It is the elimination of these important programs.

Just take a look at the list that is prepared for us in the committee report. Title I, school-wide programs. Goals 2000. We know that the majority does not like Goals 2000. Why do they not just come forward with a straightforward bill to eliminate it. Instead they talk about Dollars to the Classroom and in the bill is the elimination of Goals 2000. School To Work is also on the list. Eisenhower Professional Development. Every one of the majority members of our committee talks about the importance of teacher training, and they are eliminating Eisenhower Professional Development.

STAR schools, magnet schools, gifted and talented, arts and education, civic education, and all of these very, very important things. They have taken the funding, lumped it all together in a \$2 billion program and given it to the States.

There is no assurance that the States or the governors or anybody that will be handling the distribution of this money will send these Dollars to the Classroom. There is nothing in the bill that requires the State agencies or the State government or whoever is going to distribute the money to put this money into the classrooms. So it is a fraud. It is a basic effort to try to eliminate these important programs.

The bill will change the whole nature of education funding where we have built into it accountability. As the previous speakers on this side have pointed out, accountability is very important. The distinguished chairman of our committee gave a passionate speech on the floor earlier this week about the need for quality and accountability in Head Start, and yet here today we are debating a bill that virtually eliminates all accountability in the 31 education programs that are included in this block grant.

The programs that are listed are basically geared to disadvantaged children. We have no assurance that the disadvantaged in our communities are going to be better served.

The idea that this bill is eliminating Federal bureaucracy, and that is why we have to block grant it to the States, is a complete fraud. Every person that has testified from the Federal Government about the amount of administrative monies that are going into the management of these programs will tell us that the U.S. Department of Education spends no more than 2 percent of the Federal budget for administrative purposes. So 98 percent of the funding is going to the States for the purposes that are outlined in these 31 eliminated programs.

Look at the programs and we will see that some of it is not classroom designated, but that is not the fault of the Federal Government. It is for teacher training, counseling and all of these other things. So that is an absolute misstatement.

The second thing I have heard over and over is that there are 760 education programs, and the Federal Government therefore has this huge, mountainous bureaucracy. Let me correct the facts. The U.S. Department of Education has only 183 programs out of which only 102 are in the elementary secondary level. So we are talking about 760 programs that are in the NIH, in Commerce, in Agriculture, in Interior, in all the other areas of government, but not the U.S. Department of Education.

So we are mixing all sorts of rationale for this very, very devious effort to try to eliminate the whole concept of Federal aid to education, and I urge this House to defeat this bill.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would just note to the previous speaker that these programs are not eliminated. They continue. They will continue in Hawaii, they will continue in Michigan, they will continue in Ohio. We just changed from Father Knows Best in terms of the Federal Government to the local schools are going to decide what is best for those students, and that is where those dollars are going to be utilized.

I would note to the gentlewoman from Hawaii that under this bill, the authorization bill that Hawaii is going to get \$1.8 million more under this program which accounts for about \$9,300 per school and \$425 per classroom.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), whose district will benefit from this program.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time, and I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the committee for bringing this bill forward.

This is common sense reform, taking 31 programs of the Department of Education, consolidating them and block granting the money back to the States. They have made sure that we have held States harmless from losing funds, so every school in America will benefit as a result of this.

But as I have listened to this debate this morning, it conjures up memories. Memories of the debate that we had over welfare reform in this House for years. The debate was never over money; the debate was always over who was going to reform welfare. Were we going to continue the Washington Knows Best mentality and try to reform it from Washington, or were we going to send these programs back to the 50 States, the 50 laboratories of democracy, and allow them to reform welfare, to meet the needs of the people in their States.

□ 0945

We did it. The President signed the bill on the third try.

What has happened? We have had a 50 percent, almost 50 percent reduction in case loads in welfare all around the country. We have got another opportunity here today to move power and influence away from Washington back home to States, local communities, and, in this case, most importantly, to parents of children who attend school.

The question over how we are going to reform education and how we are going to ensure that our children get a better education is the essence of this bill. We have got one side of the aisle that wants Washington to continue to mandate on the States, mandate on local schools what should happen, make those decisions here.

We on the Republican side say no. Let us trust parents. Let us trust the teachers and our local communities to make those decisions about our children's future at home where those decisions belong.

This is a great piece of legislation. Let us support it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I would prefer if the other side went so we can even out the time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of Michigan (Mr. SMITH) whose district will benefit from this.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Chairman, as I have been down here since 1993, I see one danger, and that is many people in Washington tend to become elitists. They study a problem. They think they can solve that problem better than anybody else in the world even if it is a local problem.

In this case, we have come up with many decisions on how the Washington money has to be spent as we send it back to local schools and to the States. So we say, look, here is some money to build a roof, but you can only use it for roof building. Here is money for the Internet and wiring for the Internet, but that is all you can spend it for. If you have already put in that kind of technology, tough luck.

This bill moves that decision making from Washington back to teachers, back to parents, back to that local school board. Anybody that believes that those solutions that are closest to the problem have the best chance in success of solving that problem are going to support this kind of legislation that gets 95 percent of the money out of Washington, gives it back to the classrooms where we can use it to teach students to the best of the ability of those parents.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) whose district will receive \$31.5 million more under this program.

Mr. DELAY. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the money. I am rising in support of this common sense legislation and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Today we have a simple choice. We can give more money to teachers and classrooms to help students learn, or we can give more money to the Washington bureaucracy.

So if my colleagues are in favor of improving education in this Nation, they will vote for this piece of legislation. If my colleagues are in favor of expanding the Washington bureaucracy, they will vote against this legislation.

The American people believe that education is best handled at the local level, not in Washington. This legislation gives our teachers and school boards help without giving them unfunded mandates.

Make no mistake about it. This legislation is a winner for our Nation's

schools. Under this bill, no school districts would lose money. This bill signals and shows how Federal education dollars can be delivered to our Nation's schools. It will send more dollars directly to the classroom while giving States and local educators more funding options.

School districts could choose to put greater amounts of Federal money into priorities such as school technology, teacher improvement, and school reform.

Madam Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote for this legislation and vote to really improve education in this country.

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

Madam Chairman, I am sorry, but I disagree with the previous speaker. The fact is that States will lose money on the reduction of the appropriation bill. Hawaii will lose \$77 million. As a matter of fact, they realize it because they put it in the bill; that "if the amount allocated to a State to carry out this title for any fiscal year is insufficient to pay the full amounts that all local education agencies in such State are eligible to receive under paragraph (2) for such year, the State shall ratably reduce such amounts for such year." They knew that the money was going to be reduced.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

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

Mr. GREEN. Madam Chairman, I will try and talk as fast as I can in 2 minutes on what I have heard just since I have been here on the floor.

My colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), he and I share Harris County. I know if he gets \$31 million, I know where he is taking it out of. He is taking it out of inner city schools like I represent.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) represents a very suburban district. If that is the intent of this bill, and that may very well be happening, then that is a great reason to oppose it.

Let me talk a little bit about the title of the this bill, the truth in taxation is truth in Dollars to the Classroom. The truth in the labeling in this bill is something we should have, because if it actually sends dollars to the classroom, how come the report I see from my folks in Texas show that we are going to lose \$17 million, 9.3 percent of the programs that are allocated under this to the Dollars in the Classroom? So I think maybe the numbers are incorrect.

This is just a continuation, Madam Chairman, of what I have seen in the last 4 years. In 1995, we saw an effort to eliminate the Department of Education, attack on school lunches, the effort just last week to have Federal Government tell local States what to do with bilingual education even with

State money and eliminate safe and drug-free schools.

So what we are seeing now is under a false labeling, Dollars to the Classroom. We are seeing an effort to block grant a great many Federal funds. Eighty-five percent of the Federal funding for education goes to 12 key programs, Title I, Pell Grants, IDE, Individuals with Disabilities. That is where most of the money is at. That is in these programs, not in the programs they are talking about, although these are impacted by this.

So, again, the block granting to States would probably benefit districts like my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). I represent a very inner city district; 60 percent minority population. Most of the students are minority. They are either poor or they have language needs that need to be addressed.

What we are seeing in this bill is the taking away of the urban needs where this targeted money goes to and sending it to the suburbs. That should be a State decision, but let us not give them Federal money to make that State decision.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Madam Chairman, I would note again there is no elimination of programs in this bill and that the State of Texas under this bill would get \$31.5 million more.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) whose district in his State will receive more than \$4 million.

Mr. JONES. Madam Chairman, Dollars to the Classroom will free up \$2.7 billion of the taxpayers' money so that dollars can go directly to the schools. If we truly want to make a difference in education of our Nation's children, the Dollars to the Classroom Act is an important step forward.

Under this bill, education decisions will be made by the parents, the teachers, communities who best know our children and who together hold the key to strengthening our schools.

My State of North Carolina will receive additional dollars. I can assure my colleagues that those dollars will be better spent by the people of North Carolina than the bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. Madam Chairman, if we want to truly educate our children, we need to return our tax dollars to the classrooms where it can truly make a difference.

Madam Chairman, in closing, if we want to help our children, we need to vote for Dollars to the Classroom, give it back to the parents, give it back to the communities, and help education in America.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Madam Chairman, everybody loses in this bill. This is not a bill to invest in American education, the kind of new investment we need. This is a bill to move money around.

This is a Houdini bill. This is a swindle. This is a con game brought to us by the people who wanted to abolish the Department of Education in 1994. They wanted to reduce education funding by \$4 billion in 1995.

This is another way to do the same thing that the voters have already rejected. This is an abolishment of Federal authority in the area of education. Already the States have most of the authority. We only have 7 percent of Federal expenditures, therefore, Federal's influence and control can be no more than 7 percent.

The other 93 percent of the authority to make decisions, the authority to have our education system is in the hands of the States already. If education is in a bad state, it is because the States have made it so. Giving them more money from the Federal Government will not help the matter.

When World War II started, we were unprepared to fight a war. The draftees were in bad health from across the country from various States because the States had neglected them. Their health was poor. We had to have Federal intervention to deal with that.

We were approaching the 21st Century, and we are not going to be prepared for global leadership because we are not allowing the Federal Government to exercise the minimal influence that it has been exercising to try to improve education in the States.

This is a con game. These are Houdini experts. The public I think is smart enough to understand. There is no new money here. The people who wanted to abolish the Department of Education and the Federal authority of education have taken a different route.

We need a major investment in education for school construction. We need a major investment for technology. We need a major investment to reduce class sizes by having more teachers. We need to do those things and do them right away in order for us to keep pace with the kind of leadership role that we have in the world at this point.

We are at a pivotal point in our history. Yet, we are trivializing and almost making a joke of the whole responsibility that we have. My colleagues are playing around with something that is very vital to the national security. This is a swindle.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Madam Chairman, I would note again that reducing class size is an eligible activity under this program, and the State of New York, under this bill, would get \$13 million more than current law.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), a member of the committee whose State would receive \$16.8 million more.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) for bringing this issue forward.

This is not a swindle. The Federal Government provides 7 percent, I have been told this many times, 7 percent of the money and 70 to 80 percent of the paperwork. They are the bureaucracy that stifles our system.

This is about more teachers, less bureaucracies. This does move money around from the bureaucracy to the classroom. How do we do it? How do we put \$800 million in the classroom and \$9,300 per school to \$425 per classroom with no school getting less? Because there are 31 Federal programs who have 31 managers here in Washington and their staffs. That is 50 States. That makes 1,550 program managers, because every State has to have one, and all of their staffs.

All the thousands of grant riders that have to go through all the Federal paperwork to get this money for our schools. That is where the money comes from. There is not one grant rider, there is not one bureaucrat that enters the classroom. Urban, rural, and poor districts often do not even apply.

Seven percent of our money comes from Washington in education. Many of my districts get zero to 2 percent. The Federal grant process is difficult. Dollars to the Classroom makes good sense. A Federal program manager, State program managers, grant riders, they do nothing to raise the quality of education in this country. But dollars in the classroom will make a difference without raising taxes.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. HILLEARY), a member of the powerful Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. HILLEARY. Madam Chairman, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 3248, Dollars to the Classroom Act, and a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am proud to say I have already been able to vote in favor of this essential legislation that improves the quality education our children receive. It will be the States, not the Federal Government, that will direct these funds to the classroom.

As a Tennessean, I trust my State's ability and the people there to help our children much more than a bureaucrat in Washington who has never even set foot on Tennessee soil. In addition, the States must ensure quality by directing 95 percent of these funds to the classroom. They can not and will not be able to divert funds to other areas and State projects. This translates into more supplies, more computers, more teachers, and higher teacher salaries.

□ 1000

I want to stress also that all the additional money will not have the

strings that are attached to Federal education dollars at the present time. Right now, if Washington says to spend the money on cafeteria silverware, a school system must spend it on new silverware, even if there is plenty of silverware at that location. Thus, even if that school desperately needs more teachers, more computers, or more textbooks, they would have to waste these Federal dollars on more knives, more spoons, and more forks.

Dollars to the Classroom allows local and State educators to put the money where it belongs. Let us do what is right by our children. I urge my colleagues to support the Dollars to the Classroom Act.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), whose school district in his State will receive at least \$8.3 million more under the act.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Chairman, I thank the committee for bringing this bill to the floor. I think the fundamental point here is that no school district has to lose money or will lose money under this bill. This is not about school districts losing money. This is about bureaucrats in Washington losing money. This is about bureaucrats at the State level losing money. This is not about school districts losing money.

Those people who say this money is going to go from one school district to another are not reading the bill the way the bill has to be read. This is the difference in whether 95 cents out of every education dollar gets to the classroom, or 65 cents out of every education dollar gets to the classroom.

This is clearly not something that people who are in favor of the bureaucracy growing would want to be for. It is clearly something that people who are for money being spent in classrooms, on teachers, on education should be for. This is about a teacher who knows every student's name having more to say about how the money is spent. This is about districts that now may not qualify for all 31 of these different grant programs, but is a district that gets to qualify for money, they get to use the money in the way that they understand is best for their district.

Even the opponents of this bill concede that the Federal impact they say is minimal. Well, the minimal impact is not what does the job. What does the job is making education work. It is involving families more in the process. It is involving teachers more in the process. It is involving the local building administrator in the process. It is figuring out what can be done for those kids at that school on that day with 95 percent of this money.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, may I just inquire how much time we have remaining on our side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has 5 min-

utes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) who serves on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, whose State would get \$31.5 million more.

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, whether we are talking about education savings accounts, opportunity scholarships, or block grants, what this is all about is who should benefit more, bureaucrats or children. Unfortunately, there are those who would prefer to see a bureaucrat get a paycheck rather than see a child get an education.

This act provides more money and greater flexibility to the States so that local officials can decide how to spend these funds on their schoolchildren. Opponents say States cannot be trusted with such a responsibility. Apparently they have forgotten that the Founders of this Nation placed the responsibility of education with the States, not the Federal Government. The Founding Fathers trusted their States, and I trust the Founding Fathers.

Opponents also say this bill cuts the amount of money that will go to public schools. That is simply untrue. Millions of dollars extra, additional dollars, go to public school classrooms. The reality is that this bill reduces bureaucratic meddling, increases flexibility, increases funding, and ensures that more resources are spent on our children.

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

Madam Chairman, the last two speakers spoke about money going to bureaucrats. The money we are talking about does not go to pay bureaucrats' salaries, it goes to help needy children. What we are talking about here is not money for bureaucrats, but money that is going to be denied children for special programs.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Chairman, I have heard more rhetoric going around here in the last hour or so than I think is warranted by this particular subject. If we were serious about improving educational opportunities, this particular subject matter would have come up during the course of regular deliberations over the Secondary and Elementary School Act reauthorization, which is going to be next year.

The fact of the matter is every time our colleagues on the other side stand up and tell us how much money is here for every State, what they are really telling us is they are authorizing a certain amount of money. But the fact of the matter is they are not appropriating that amount of money.

What does history show us when things get block granted? It shows us this is all about the "Contract on America" theory that if they block grant things, they can eventually defund them. No matter how much is authorized to be appropriated, in the end, when it comes to be appropriated, it has been reduced.

That is what happened under Title 6. Programs were put in a block grant and they were defunded over time. It is what happened in other areas of community service block grants in different communities, and it happens over and over again. It is part of the theory of putting them in a block grant, defunding them, and moving the money to some other priority.

Madam Chairman, our priority on this side of the aisle is education. We do not need to be throwing programs like technology training, programs to combat illiteracy, programs for gifted and talented children, education reform projects into a block grant so that we can lose accountability on them and fail to track whether or not the money is actually being spent in that regard and doing a good job, and then eventually having the focus shifted so they get defunded.

We need to make sure that we do what the Federal Government has always done, provide the resources that are requested by local and State governments. It is the job of local and State governments to do the general, operational task of education. That is why they have 94 percent of the responsibility and they take it that way. The 6 or 7 percent of monies that are spent from the Federal resources on elementary and secondary education are targeted to programs where a request has been made that money comes down from the Federal Government for assistance. That money is for reform projects, it is for illiteracy projects, it is for technology and for teachers.

If we want to move forward, we will remodel our classrooms and make sure that we have more teachers in the classroom, and we will not set up a structure to defund education.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) who is on the Speaker's Task Force on Education Reform, and whose State of Florida receives \$3 million more under this legislation.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Madam Chairman, despite all the heated rhetoric today, there are some stubborn facts that cannot be denied. First of all, Dollars to the Classroom requires that 95 percent of the funds go into the classrooms where my two boys attend public school in Florida.

Passage of this bill will mean an additional \$800 million to local schools, \$9,300 per school for my two boys and \$425 per classroom for my two boys in public schools.

This class warfare argument that we are hearing today really hides a simple elementary fact and that is that the

state of modern American liberalism in 1998 believes that local communities, that parents, that my boys' teachers, that my boys' principals, are too stupid or corrupt to educate my children. That is an offensive fact, and yet that is a fact that has lain at the heart of liberals' arguments in this country for the past 60 years.

It is time we get past this and ask a simple question, and that is: How do we get the most money to teachers? How do we get the most money to local school boards? How do we get the best education to not only my boys, but to those people that come from inner cities?

If these liberals were so interested in helping students in inner cities, then why would they continue to fight choice when the majority of people in inner cities want to be able to choose what schools their children go to?

Madam Chairman, with the passage of this bill, we ensure that States and local communities can look at each school's problems and assess them on an individual basis and make sure that every child in America has the opportunity to grow up in a country where they have a chance to pursue the American dream with an American education.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) be allowed to control the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

I do not know why we have to get into this name calling about this is a "liberal idea." This is not a liberal idea. This is about kids and their education.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, this bill before us, this so-called Dollars to the Classroom bill, really sends the wrong message about our responsibilities to improve public schools and would weaken our national commitment to education.

It would eliminate 31 elementary and secondary education initiatives and then block grant these programs for the Governor of each State to decide how the money is spent. Among the programs eliminated: After-school programs that give kids alternatives to crime and violence; technology grants to help prepare the schools for the 21st century; drug and violence prevention initiatives that are crucial and needed right now.

The proponents of this bill cannot guarantee that a single dollar would be spent by any State on investing in these programs or technology.

We need to reject this smoke and mirrors of the funding in this bill. Just

because the authors of this legislation would authorize a higher level of funding and throw around the increased figures does not mean this Congress will appropriate at that level.

Madam Chairman, we need to scrap the rhetoric. Look at the 1994 independent General Accounting Office study. It says of all Federal funds allocated through State education agencies, 98 percent reach the local level. We want local school districts, local communities to make decisions. This month alone, 10 school districts in my district in Northern Wisconsin, little towns, Niagara, Rhinelander, got an \$800,000 technology grant to enhance distance learning. The idea for this project was entirely locally driven. It will be carried out locally, yet it can only happen with a strong national commitment to education. That is the local innovation and it is a national commitment we are looking for. This bill takes us in the wrong direction.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I wanted to remind the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) that as a matter of fact, the only time any block grant money was cut, it was cut by the Democrats, Chapter 2, not by any Republicans.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. LINDA SMITH), who will receive an additional \$1,229,000 for her local classrooms.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Madam Chairman, I think we are standing here today debating a philosophy of who we think knows best for our children. For me, is it bureaucrats 2,500 miles away from the classroom or is it the teacher, the parent, the superintendent, and the community? I am going to bet that the people in my State believe it is their families that know best, and I believe that this measure moves us closer to that.

Now, it is not hard to know what my people want, because for 2 years I had a task force of public schoolteachers and the bottom line was this:

They said, do not give us any more regulation. Get rid of the Federal programs. Get rid of the paperwork. The Federal Government is making us spend all of our money on administering Federal programs and Federal paperwork. Just give us back the money.

Well, I trust the teachers in my district, in my State, more than I do the bureaucrats, too. This just simply says instead of us administering, managing, mandating education from here in Washington, D.C., we are going to give 95 percent of that back to the classroom.

I will tell my colleagues that my grandson's teacher can use that \$400 a lot more than a bureaucrat can here in Washington, D.C. This is a great bill and I commend it to the body.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, I do not think that the gentlewoman's grandson's teacher will get that money, because her State loses 16.5 percent.

In closing, I want to say that I know there are compassionate, reasonable people on that side of the aisle that have great sympathy for some of these 31 programs that are being cut. I want them to understand that in the bill, under section 107, every one of those 31 programs are repealed. That is what the section says: These programs are repealed. Which means that under a block grant, they may or may not provide that.

The other side talks about wanting to tell the locals that we know best. In the other section it does not say "may" in the use of those funds, it said "shall." "They shall," for these 27 ideas, use the money for these ideas. And they run the gamut of anything we can think of, including some things that can be interpreted to be using money that really does not go to the educational need, especially of those special populations.

Madam Chairman, I wonder who is telling the locals what to do? Who is micromanaging? Who is being a liberal, us or them?

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) who worked so hard for 2 years to try to save children rather than bureaucrats.

□ 1015

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, the liberal Democratic philosophy seems to be based on the Federal Government knows best. We believe that the States, the local teachers, not the Federal Government, should be making the decisions.

This bill does not hurt poor kids. None of the programs for poor kids go away. It only goes away for bureaucrats. Perhaps the gentleman believes that having bureaucracy eat up 35 percent of our Federal funds is effective. I do not.

We can use these funds for all the programs listed, and we make them much more effective by requiring 9 percent to get to the classroom.

I want to read just a portion of a letter from the Missouri State Teachers Association that represents 41,000 members. They have always made local control a major tenet.

They say, the history of Federal programs has been one of bureaucracy and red tape. The application of the common sense approach to assist the needs of the local community's public schools has been handcuffed by Federal Rules, regulations and excessive administrative overhead. Freedom of choice is what we support.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to close by making sure, again, that everybody understands we are not talking about what the committee may have done in relationship to appropriations. That has nothing to

do with this legislation. Those are the figures that are being presented by those lobbyists downtown both in the department and those lobbyists who want to protect their downtown bureaucracy and those who want to protect the bureaucracy back in the State. We are not talking about those figures.

By the time my senior Senator is finished and they are finished with conference, the amount of money for education will be up, not down. No matter what the appropriators do, there will be more money to your individual classroom through this legislation, no matter how much they may cut. It is important to remember that.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Dollars to Classroom Act. Each one of the members of this chamber has visited numerous schools located in their Congressional District. On each of those visits, principals, teachers, parents, and students, each have approached us saying if we just had a little more funding we could do so much more. Today the House of Representatives is going to do more.

Today we start sending dollars directly to the classroom; what a novel concept! For the first time in 30 years, we are beginning to take meaningful steps in improving our educational system.

The Dollars to Classroom Act will eliminate block grants. Which in turn will improve the current education system by eliminating federal bureaucracy and by redirecting federal education dollars to our nation's schools.

This legislation will allow states and local educators to gain more funding options and a wide array of flexibility in receiving federal funding. The schools in each and every Congressional District will reach your classrooms faster and will be used more effectively.

When I travel throughout the Seventh Congressional District of Georgia, I meet parents and teachers and I know these individuals realize what steps need to be taken in educating their child. Our schools need new construction, and our children need new computers. The list of needs is great and the resources are scarce.

What better way to give to America's future than sending 95% federal funding directly to the classroom. The additional funding will provide a better education for children who some day in the not too distant future will be the leaders of this nation.

Ninety-five percent of all the dollars a school district receives will be spent on children in the classroom. This bill is a definite turning point for education. H.R. 3248 takes a scissor to the bureaucratic red tape.

The Dollars to Classroom Act puts children first by sending education dollars directly to the classroom. Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation for the sake of our children and for the sake of education across this country.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Chairman, Dollars From the Classroom is a more appropriate term for this bill. There is no doubt that we want to ensure all of our children access to quality education. But block granting these 31 proposed programs will do nothing to enhance the quality of education—only harm it.

A recent GAO study of Federal and State education financing patterns found that States overwhelmingly are less likely to focus state directed education funding on low-income students than are programs with funding that is federally directed.

What this bill does for schools that have low-income children is put them at a disadvantage. For example, one of the provisions in H.R. 3248 eliminates the existing requirement that 50% of a school's enrolled children be from low-income families in order to conduct a schoolwide program under Title I. School districts like mine need this 50% threshold in order to ensure that schools that have significant levels of poverty are able to conduct total school reform. We have these requirements because poor school districts have traditionally been underserved and the children often undereducated.

Reforming a program like Title I without even having committee hearings is completely irresponsible. If we really want to expand the Title I program, let's wait until the reauthorization of ESEA, when a greater number of individuals can have the opportunity to give this full consideration. This has been the problem with many of our education bills that have come to the floor this session—attempts to rework ESEA at an inappropriate time.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of fairness and vote against H.R. 3248.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3248. It is a flawed approach to education funding, and it will take money from students who should be the focus of any education legislation. Coupled with the crippling funding cuts to education currently included in the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations bill, H.R. 3248 will achieve a loss in "dollars to the classroom" in every state in the U.S.

The bill completely eliminates states' accountability for the spending of education dollars. If adopted, this bill would give hundreds of millions of dollars a year to the state education departments with no way to account for which dollars are actually spent in the classrooms. In fact, federal programs currently provide a much larger percentage of their funding to classroom activities than state and local education programs.

Many have argued that this bill would cut down on the bureaucracy involved in allocating federal educational funds, but we will instead be creating or enlarging 50 state bureaucracies.

Federal educational funding represents less than 10% of most states' educational funding, and it has traditionally been targeted at poor or otherwise disadvantaged students. We have long shied away from giving general federal aid to schools and instead tried to make federal educational funding have a real impact.

In the last few years, we have already increased the flexibility of federal educational funding by combining similar programs and allowing statewide waivers to federal requirements on a trial basis in the Goals 2000 act. We should continue our successful efforts at

making federal educational funding more flexible for the states, but we should not embrace a wholesale dilution of federal educational priorities.

Education professionals across the board—teachers, principals, and administrators—oppose this bill. These individuals who have devoted their lives to helping children know that this bill would actually harm many children throughout the United States. Education professionals agree that the most important education issues we should focus on are those that actually benefit the students—well-qualified teachers, small class sizes and school modernization. This bill actually cancels a number of teacher training initiatives, initiatives that will almost certainly not be replicated at the state level.

National educational standards go hand in hand with teacher training in helping students achieve excellence and the ability to compete successfully with students from all over the country. Since its inception—originally proposed by President Bush—Goals 2000 has helped local school districts set priorities to allow their students and teachers to achieve excellence. This bill would cancel the Goals 2000 program.

I urge my colleagues to keep the best interests of the children of our nation in mind and oppose this ill-conceived measure.

Mr. CASTLE. Madam Chairman, today the House is voting on H.R. 3248, the Dollars to the Classroom Act. I will support this legislation today, but I believe that the legislation must be improved in a number of key areas before it can become law. I would like to take this opportunity to explain the reservations I have regarding the bill in its current form. If these issues are not addressed, I will not support the bill if it is returned by the Senate for a final vote this year.

First, let me say that I support the goal of this legislation. We must work to ensure that all federal education assistance directly benefits our children. These funds should not be wasted on unnecessary bureaucracy. However, achieving this goal is not simple. I am very interested in finding ways to streamline federal programs and bring more efficiency to the Federal Government's role in education. I do not support the status quo and I do not believe that what we have now is working. The concept of Dollars to the Classroom gives us a new option for making changes that may benefit students in the country.

I have struggled for some time in trying to determine if this legislation will achieve its intended goals. I have supported moving the bill through the legislative process while working with Committee staff and other Members to resolve my initial concerns. After a lot of careful thought, and after reviewing analysis from many different sources, I think the fundamental concept of Dollars to the Classroom is worth advancing while we work to answer key questions before it can become law. This may not occur this year and probably should not. There is not much time left in this session for the Senate to pass the bill and to work out all remaining issues. This bill establishes the principle that more federal dollars must directly benefit our children. We should now work to ensure the legislation achieves this principle. It may be best to address these issues comprehensively next year when Congress must reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

As I noted, there are several unanswered questions raised by the legislation. One that must be answered is exactly how much money is going to go to the states and local districts. We have a number of estimates, but we don't have hard numbers. My view is that additional work must be done to understand how current levels of funding will be changed by the Dollars to the Classroom Act. To help you understand my concern, I have attached two charts, both prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). The first chart raises some questions. It takes the Fiscal Year 1998 funding level and compares it to the amounts a state would receive if the money was put into this block grant. You'll notice there are differences in how much money each state gets. I was elected to represent the people of Delaware, and when I see a chart from CRS, the nonpartisan research agency for the Congress, saying that the State of Delaware could lose 13.2% of its education funding, it concerns me greatly. Now, I am not going to argue that these numbers are perfect, they are estimates. However, they raise the legitimate question that some states may receive less funding in total under this legislation. The second chart that I have attached, is a comparison of how much the Local Education Agencies would get, using Fiscal Year 1998 numbers, before and after the block grant. This chart is more encouraging. Delaware wins by a slight percentage and most districts do not lose, but again there is variation in these numbers. I have been assured by the Chairman that he will work with me to ensure that Delaware is treated fairly in this legislation.

We need to sit down and look at this data and understand how funds are going to flow so that we can't be absolutely sure that any change in funds is truly for the benefit of our children. I want more dollars in the classroom, but I will not support final passage of this legislation unless I am convinced that it will benefit the children and schools in Delaware.

In addition to the funding process, we should review the 31 programs included in the block grant to be sent to school districts to ensure that no important aspect of the specific programs will be lost. Let me give you an example. The Comprehensive School Reform program involves a very important—in fact crucial—research component. States and locals do not have the capacity to do research and disseminate research like we do at the national level. They simply don't have the capacity. Does this mean that we want to sacrifice the research being done in this program? I think we need to consider that as part of the process of evaluating this proposal and we have not done that. The same principle applies for the Eisenhower Professional Development program and possibly other programs included in this block grant. The fact that some of these programs contain research and national components indicates that we must review them more closely to ensure we retain aspects that help improve education for our children.

The final area that I want to address is the accountability measures included in this proposal. They have been improved, but need to be further strengthened. We need to ensure that the accountability measures are very strong. Let me give you an example. Yesterday, Congressman Roemer and I introduced a bill to expand the Ed-Flex demonstration

projects to all 50 states. This makes sense to me. Our bill is based on a strong program currently available to only 12 states. Ed-Flex allows states to waive burdensome regulations that interfere with the schools' main purpose—to improve academic achievement. This is flexibility, but it is flexibility with accountability. In order to be eligible a state has to have approved content standards, performance measures and assessments. In addition, to be eligible for an extension of a waiver, schools have to establish procedures for increasing the percentage of teachers in the state who have demonstrated subject matter knowledge and pedagogical skill necessary to provide effective instruction in content areas, while decreasing the percentage of teachers without such knowledge in high poverty schools. This is accountability in combination with flexibility. I encourage my colleagues to join Mr. Roemer and I in encouraging responsible flexibility.

I strongly support the goal of making every federal education program more effective. Every dollar we spend should benefit our schoolchildren as directly as possible. The Dollars to the Classroom bill is a reasonable start. It is not perfect and this legislation must be further refined to ensure that it meets its intended goal. I will work to improve the bill if it receives further consideration this year, but I believe the best strategy would be to address all federal K–12 programs in the context of re-authorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1999. I look forward to actively participating in that effort.

TABLE 11C.—ESTIMATED STATE ALLOCATIONS UNDER H.R. 3248, AS ORDERED TO BE REPORTED, COMPARED TO ESTIMATES PREPARED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (ED) OF FY 1998 GRANTS UNDER ALL PROGRAMS PROPOSED TO BE CONSOLIDATED UNDER H.R. 3248

[H.R. 3248 Estimates: An Amount Equal To FY 1998 Allocations Under Formula Grant Programs To Be Consolidated Is First Allocated To Each State. Next, Remaining Block Grant Appropriations (Assumed To Be Equal To \$2.74 Billion Minus the Formula Grant Portion) Are Allocated With 50% in Proportion To ESEA Title I, Part A Grants And 50% in Proportion To Population Aged 5–17. Grants Are Estimated At The Maximum Authorized Level For FY 1999.]

[ED Estimates of FY 1998 Grants: Include Actual Or Projected Grants Under All Programs Proposed To Be Consolidated. For Grants To Entities That Provide Services Nationwide, Funds Are Spread Among All States, in Proportion To Population Aged 5–17, Data Were Received From ED On Sept. 15, 1998.]

State	Total estimated grant under H.R. 3248 at FY 1999 authorized level	ED estimates of total FY 1998 grants	Percentage difference
Alabama	\$43,427,000	\$37,847,464	14.7
Alaska	10,396,000	21,791,724	-52.3
Arizona	42,557,000	39,586,425	7.5
Arkansas	26,450,000	21,687,428	22.0
California	315,580,000	298,178,752	5.8
Colorado	31,706,000	31,361,652	1.1
Connecticut	27,552,000	30,118,669	-8.5
Delaware	10,134,000	11,672,901	-13.2
District of Columbia	10,009,000	29,603,406	-66.2
Florida	126,307,000	120,603,903	4.7
Georgia	72,595,000	62,047,160	17.0
Hawaii	11,295,000	34,723,242	-67.5
Idaho	12,016,000	13,038,722	-7.8
Illinois	118,597,000	106,357,682	11.5
Indiana	48,734,000	47,454,205	2.7
Iowa	23,036,000	38,284,832	-39.8
Kansas	23,464,000	23,615,556	-0.6
Kentucky	42,372,000	37,141,163	14.1
Louisiana	59,024,000	62,317,031	-5.3
Maine	12,505,000	12,142,653	3.0
Maryland	42,122,000	43,739,157	-3.7
Massachusetts	53,801,000	59,841,778	-10.1
Michigan	109,986,000	90,721,762	21.2
Minnesota	40,119,000	36,383,455	10.3
Mississippi	37,531,000	32,293,424	16.2
Missouri	49,873,000	49,857,568	0.0
Montana	11,462,000	13,052,614	-12.2
Nebraska	14,727,000	21,557,260	-31.7
Nevada	12,648,000	12,905,969	-2.0
New Hampshire	10,987,000	13,283,611	-17.3
New Jersey	66,235,000	54,511,691	21.5
New Mexico	21,328,000	26,175,853	-18.5
New York	211,655,000	185,851,927	13.9
North Carolina	59,565,000	59,271,274	0.5

TABLE 11C.—ESTIMATED STATE ALLOCATIONS UNDER H.R. 3248, AS ORDERED TO BE REPORTED, COMPARED TO ESTIMATES PREPARED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (ED) OF FY 1998 GRANTS UNDER ALL PROGRAMS PROPOSED TO BE CONSOLIDATED UNDER H.R. 3248—Continued

[H.R. 3248 Estimates: An Amount Equal To FY 1998 Allocations Under Formula Grant Programs To Be Consolidated Is First Allocated To Each State. Next, Remaining Block Grant Appropriations (Assumed To Be Equal To \$2.74 Billion Minus the Formula Grant Portion) Are Allocated With 50% in Proportion To ESEA Title I, Part A Grants And 50% in Proportion To Population Aged 5–17. Grants Are Estimated At The Maximum Authorized Level For FY 1999.]

[ED Estimates of FY 1998 Grants: Include Actual Or Projected Grants Under All Programs Proposed To Be Consolidated. For Grants To Entities That Provide Services Nationwide, Funds Are Spread Among All States, in Proportion To Population Aged 5–17, Data Were Received From ED On Sept. 15, 1998.]

State	Total estimated grant under H.R. 3248 at FY 1999 authorized level	ED estimates of total FY 1998 grants	Percentage difference
North Dakota	10,131,000	12,982,323	-22.0
Ohio	110,142,000	96,755,688	13.8
Oklahoma	32,982,000	34,898,615	-5.5
Oregon	28,316,000	28,584,893	-0.9
Pennsylvania	116,992,000	106,949,829	9.4
Rhode Island	11,349,000	16,087,033	-29.5
South Carolina	34,950,000	35,192,514	-0.7
South Dakota	10,562,000	14,255,337	-25.9
Tennessee	48,747,000	48,234,290	1.1
Texas	220,192,000	188,545,340	16.8
Utah	18,817,000	21,657,436	-13.1
Vermont	9,830,000	11,905,763	-17.4
Virginia	50,445,000	52,686,574	-4.3
Washington	47,584,000	56,993,741	-16.5
West Virginia	21,863,000	24,498,214	-10.8
Wisconsin	49,155,000	43,326,942	13.5
Wyoming	9,650,000	11,682,323	-17.4
Puerto Rico	71,099,000	51,413,604	38.3
Outlying Areas	13,700,000	12,140,665	12.8
BIA	13,700,000	9,749,076	40.5
Other		28,726,870	na
Total	2,740,000,000	2,686,289,000	2.0

Table prepared by CRS on Sept. 16, 1998.

TABLE 15.—ESTIMATED STATE ALLOCATIONS SPECIFICALLY TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (LEA'S) UNDER H.R. 3248 COMPARED TO ESTIMATED ALLOCATIONS TO LEA'S UNDER CURRENT PROGRAMS THAT WOULD BE CONSOLIDATED UNDER H.R. 3245

State	Total estimated grants to LEA's under H.R. 3248 (at 96%)	Total estimated grants to LEA's under current programs	Percentage change
Alabama	\$32,480,640	\$28,726,364	13.1
Alaska	8,574,720	9,973,738	-14.0
Arizona	31,996,800	27,196,850	17.6
Arkansas	19,791,360	14,926,966	32.6
California	237,103,690	212,174,852	11.7
Colorado	23,896,580	18,948,065	25.1
Connecticut	20,659,200	18,744,802	10.2
Delaware	8,339,520	7,893,343	5.7
District of Columbia	6,355,840	7,431,557	12.4
Florida	94,823,040	91,729,340	3.4
Georgia	54,471,360	42,934,372	26.9
Hawaii	8,868,480	8,995,313	26.8
Idaho	9,253,440	8,516,800	8.7
Illinois	88,915,360	72,854,420	21.9
Indiana	36,408,080	30,973,512	17.5
Iowa	17,131,200	12,779,617	34.1
Kansas	17,618,880	15,544,068	13.3
Kentucky	44,801,920	24,600,251	29.3
Louisiana	44,208,960	34,665,652	27.5
Maine	9,648,000	8,159,272	18.2
Maryland	31,515,840	25,493,567	23.5
Massachusetts	40,377,600	38,492,132	4.9
Michigan	82,742,400	65,986,110	25.4
Minnesota	30,007,680	23,832,451	25.9
Mississippi	28,125,120	21,427,695	31.3
Missouri	37,344,980	29,020,065	28.7
Montana	9,038,400	7,169,578	26.1
Nebraska	11,083,200	11,733,360	-5.5
Nevada	9,567,200	8,894,458	6.7
New Hampshire	8,675,520	7,389,104	17.4
New Jersey	49,601,280	37,348,162	32.8
New Mexico	16,026,240	13,700,687	17.0
New York	159,475,200	148,444,545	8.9
North Carolina	44,536,320	40,495,357	10.0
North Dakota	8,333,760	7,915,179	5.3
Ohio	62,574,400	85,323,229	26.4
Oklahoma	24,687,360	20,223,570	22.1
Oregon	21,254,400	17,502,102	21.0
Pennsylvania	87,825,440	71,081,085	23.7
Rhode Island	9,001,920	7,181,698	25.3
South Carolina	26,136,000	23,189,775	12.7
South Dakota	8,543,040	7,702,811	10.9
Tennessee	38,509,760	29,345,405	24.5
Texas	155,546,240	134,012,463	23.4
Utah	14,062,080	11,304,868	24.4
Vermont	8,166,880	7,350,078	11.4

TABLE 15.—ESTIMATED STATE ALLOCATIONS SPECIFICALLY TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (LEA'S) UNDER H.R. 3248 COMPARED TO ESTIMATED ALLOCATIONS TO LEA'S UNDER CURRENT PROGRAMS THAT WOULD BE CONSOLIDATED UNDER H.R. 3245—Continued

State	Total estimated grants to LEAs under H.R. 3248 (at 96%)	Total estimated grants to LEAs under current programs	Percentage change
Virginia	37,887,680	30,384,366	24.0
Washington	35,669,760	34,440,440	3.6
West Virginia	16,408,320	13,455,322	21.9
Wisconsin	36,780,480	27,895,883	32.9
Wyoming	8,081,280	6,853,872	17.9
Puerto Rico	63,332,800	40,548,467	31.5

Mr. STARK. Madam Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the so-called "Dollars to the Classroom" Act. This sham bill is a public relations play for election year votes and a policy nightmare for our children.

This bill sounds like a good idea—who could resist sending dollars to our schools? But calling the bill one thing does not make it so. We might as well have the Budweiser frogs pitching this bill because you would have to be a sucker for marketing to believe this bill will do anything to put more dollars into the classroom.

H.R. 3248 attempts to redistribute federal education dollars. It claims to be an increase, but in reality would provide less funds to the classroom. In addition, it assumes a funding level that is not included in the House Appropriations Committee reported Labor-HHS-Education bill. So, even if H.R. 3248 becomes law, the funds won't be available to finance it.

Let's review the Republican education agenda for a moment. We've debated a bill to allow prayer in schools—a right that is already protected by current law—we've discussed taking public education dollars and putting them into private voucher accounts for private schools, and my Republican colleagues have introduced legislation to eliminate the Department of Education. We have also defeated attempts to eliminate bilingual education, and defeated a bill to eliminate affirmative action programs in place at colleges and universities.

As if that weren't enough, the Majority has refused to include any of the President's education proposals in the FY '99 Labor, HHS and Education Appropriations bill. Rather than putting dollars into education, the Majority's plan would cut Head Start by 50%, prevent much needed dollars to update and modernize school facilities and eliminate funding for GOALS 2000.

The Department of Education shows that this bill, if enacted, would have a devastating impact on funds available for classrooms. In some states, the reduction of funds will exceed 60% of current funding levels. All states will lose dollars to the classroom. I am submitting for the record an analysis by the U.S. Department of Education which shows the impact on education funding if this bill were to become law.

Who opposes this legislation? The organizations and schools on the front lines of teaching. The very classroom workers this bill claims to be helping. The National Parent Teacher Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Association of School Administrators, the American Association of University Women, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of State Boards of Education, and the National Education Association all oppose this legislation.

It is clear where the Republicans stand on education. I urge my colleagues to take a real stand for our children and make a real commitment to our schools. Vote against H.R. 3248 and support effort to put real dollars into real classrooms.

IMPACT OF H.R. 3248 THE "DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM ACT"

	Allocations under current law FY 1998 ¹	Estimated allocations under H.R. 3248 1999 House committee ²	Change from current law	
			Dollars	Percent
Alabama	\$37,847,464	\$33,864,590	-\$3,982,874	-10.5
Alaska	21,791,724	7,861,824	-13,929,000	-63.9
Arizona	39,586,425	34,648,518	-4,937,906	-12.5
Arkansas	21,687,428	20,674,162	-1,013,266	-4.7
California	298,178,752	246,693,707	-51,485,045	-17.3
Colorado	31,361,652	25,153,676	-6,207,976	-19.8
Connecticut	30,118,669	21,509,447	-8,609,222	-28.6
Delaware	11,672,901	7,632,086	-4,040,815	-34.6
District of Columbia	29,603,406	7,771,532	-21,831,873	-73.7
Florida	120,603,903	99,093,164	-21,510,739	-17.8
Georgia	62,047,160	56,847,358	-5,199,802	-8.4
Hawaii	34,723,242	7,719,586	-27,003,656	-77.8
Idaho	13,038,722	8,412,811	-4,625,910	-35.5
Illinois	106,357,682	92,729,841	-13,627,841	-12.8
Indiana	47,454,205	38,515,955	-8,938,249	-18.8
Iowa	38,284,832	18,449,587	-19,835,245	-51.8
Kansas	23,615,556	18,194,580	-5,420,976	-23.0
Kentucky	37,141,163	32,558,769	-4,582,394	-12.3
Louisiana	62,317,031	45,191,954	-17,125,077	-27.5
Maine	12,142,653	8,770,726	-3,371,928	-27.8
Maryland	43,739,157	32,923,149	-10,816,008	-24.7
Massachusetts	59,841,778	42,240,583	-17,601,195	-29.4
Michigan	90,721,762	84,334,390	-6,387,372	-7.0
Minnesota	36,383,455	31,413,175	-4,970,280	-13.7
Mississippi	32,293,424	29,039,690	-3,253,734	-10.1
Missouri	49,857,568	39,162,392	-10,695,176	-21.5
Montana	13,052,614	7,923,255	-5,129,359	-39.3
Nebraska	21,557,260	11,263,406	-10,293,853	-47.8
Nevada	12,905,989	9,532,789	-3,373,200	-26.1
New Hampshire	13,283,611	7,591,797	-5,691,814	-42.8
New Jersey	54,511,691	52,155,401	-2,356,290	-4.3
New Mexico	26,175,853	16,362,927	-9,812,927	-37.5
New York	185,851,927	163,029,308	-22,822,619	-12.3
North Carolina	59,271,274	47,488,942	-11,782,332	-19.9
North Dakota	12,982,323	7,623,710	-5,358,613	-41.3
Ohio	96,755,688	85,343,169	-11,412,519	-11.8
Oklahoma	34,898,615	25,680,671	-9,217,944	-26.4
Oregon	28,854,893	21,916,128	-6,938,765	-23.3
Pennsylvania	106,949,829	90,564,769	-16,385,060	-15.3
Puerto Rico	51,413,604	54,860,183	3,446,579	6.7
Rhode Island	16,087,033	7,938,680	-8,148,353	-50.7
South Carolina	35,192,514	27,729,484	-7,463,030	-21.2
South Dakota	14,255,337	7,681,834	-6,573,503	-46.1
Tennessee	48,234,290	37,941,158	-10,293,132	-21.3
Texas	188,545,340	170,952,456	-17,592,884	-9.3
Utah	21,657,436	14,744,735	-6,912,701	-31.9
Vermont	11,905,763	7,579,018	-4,326,745	-36.3
Virginia	52,686,574	40,010,221	-12,676,352	-24.1
Washington	56,993,741	37,235,777	-19,757,964	-34.7
West Virginia	24,498,214	16,756,748	-7,741,465	-31.6
Wisconsin	43,326,942	38,478,067	-4,848,865	-11.2
Wyoming	11,682,323	7,522,112	-4,160,210	-35.6
Outlying Areas	12,140,665	10,643,000	-1,497,665	-12.3
Bureau of Indian Affairs	9,749,076	10,643,000	893,924	9.2
Totals	2,657,562,130	2,128,600,000	-528,962,130	-19.9

¹ Includes each State's total for the 26 programs proposed for consolidation under H.R. 3248 the "Dollars to the Classroom Act." Excludes funds for administrative expenses (e.g., peer review and national evaluations).

² Estimates are based on the formula H.R. 3248, Section 102, and the FY 1999 House Committee level for each program consolidated in the bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3248, the "Dollars to the Classroom" legislation. This legislation repeals many small arts programs that have met with great success, stood the test of time, and benefited children, young people and adults all across this country.

Each year, Very Special Arts brings the transforming power of the arts into the lives of over 3.5 million people. Founded 25 years ago by Jean Kennedy Smith, Very Special Arts is an international, nonprofit organization dedicated to providing educational opportunities through the arts for children and adults with disabilities. Both Very Special Arts and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts receive funding each year through the Department of Education's Arts in Education program. Very Special Arts' federal dollars are matched with state, local, corporate and foundation support in all 50 states. Each VSA state affiliate develops programs to match unique community needs and interests, further strengthening the program by guaranteeing local involvement. Whether programs take place in classrooms, nursing homes, day care facilities, fine arts centers, libraries, VA facilities, or children's hospitals, they are built on the premise that art is a universal language that strengthens communities and connects us to each other.

In May of 1999, Los Angeles will be the host city for Art & Soul, an international celebration of the arts, disability and culture sponsored by Very Special Arts. Held in conjunction with the Mayor's Office of Cultural Affairs and the Los Angeles Convention & Visitors Bureau, the five day festival will take place at the Los Angeles Convention Center, and will bring together more than 3,000 artists with disabilities from around the world. The festival will feature performances, exhibits, workshops, art demonstrations and an educational symposia—all in an effort to provide an international exchange of information on the arts, education, disability and technology among educators, artists, parents, arts organizations, and the general public. The festival will also offer a learning opportunity for the more than 600,000 Los Angeles school children. These students, 8,000 of whom have disabilities, will be invited to participate in all aspects of the festival—broadening their awareness of the endless possibilities the arts provide in education, business and technology.

Another highly effective program in my state, the VA/VSA Artist-in-Residence Program, builds independence and self-confidence in veterans across the country by using artistic outlets to enhance the rehabilitation process. The program provides veterans who receive care at VA medical centers with quality arts experiences through artist-in-residence programs and community-based activities. VSA California provides ten-week residency programs at the Palo Alto VA Day Care & Homeless Center in the Mission district of San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, the programs I have mentioned today are just two examples of the wonderful work Very Special Arts accomplishes each year in California and on behalf of all people with disabilities across our great nation. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 3248, and continue to support programs, like Very Special Arts, that provide important and valuable services for all of our constituents.

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Chairman, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 3284, the Dollars to the Classroom Act, a bill which I am proud to co-sponsor. I would like to congratulate my colleague Congressman JOE PITTS for his work in bringing this important legislation forward.

As a former high school teacher, I am concerned about the current state of our Nation's schools. Clearly the lack of progress in educational reform at the K-12 level is a serious threat to the health of the economy and to the future prosperity of American children. However, in order to place the discussion about what to do about our failing educational system in context, a brief review of the history of the economics of federal involvement in education is in order. Thus far, school reforms have focused only on increasing funding to public schools. Since 1983, government funding to public K-12 schools has increased by 44 percent and average per-student spending has increased by 32 percent. Total spending for public K-12 education now totals nearly \$300 billion per year.

One of the central problems with education funding today is where this funding goes. For example, the federal government spends approximately \$100 billion a year on more than 760 federal education programs. However, more than a third of the \$15.4 billion spent by the Department of Education on elementary and secondary education programs never reaches the all important classroom; instead it is lost in a sea of bureaucracy.

Madam Chairman, last year, the House took a first step toward assuring that taxpayer education dollars get where they are supposed to be going. The House passed, and I supported, the Dollars to Classrooms Resolution which expressed the sense of the House that the Department of Education, state education departments, and local education agencies work together to ensure that not less than 90 percent of all education funds are spent on children in their classrooms. In other words: let's get the money to the place it will do some good—the classroom.

House Republicans have had some important successes over the past few years: we've balanced the federal budget for the first time in a generation, produced the first tax cut in 16 years, and moved millions of Americans from welfare to work. Today we are building on these successes by taking an important step toward bringing the best education possible within reach of every child in this country.

The Dollars to the Classroom Act represents a major change in the federal government's approach to education funding. Instead of pouring money into the Department of Education and hoping some of it trickles down to our children's classrooms, this legislation will assure that 95 cents out of every federal education dollar goes directly to our kids' classrooms.

What does this legislation mean for America's families and children? It means that every classroom in America will receive, on average, an extra \$425 because this Act consolidates many grant programs that never reach the classroom and lifts restrictions that keep many schools from even applying for these grants. It means that \$800 million additional education dollars will go to our public schools. It means that my home state of Illinois will receive \$44 million more education dollars—an increase of more than 40%. In short, Mr. Speaker, the

passage of the Dollars to the Classroom Act means that more education dollars will reach more kids. I cannot believe that anyone can oppose this.

Madam Chairman, we have to ask ourselves where the solution to the problems with our education system lie. Some of my colleagues are convinced that if we could only send more money to the Department of Education they will be able to fix our schools.

As a teacher, I must disagree. I know that innovation in education—something we desperately need—will not come from Washington bureaucrats. In fact, they are at the root of the problem. Innovative solutions will only come from families, teachers, and local communities who actually do the job of teaching our kids.

Madam Chairman, I am happy to co-sponsor the Dollars to the Classroom Act because it will free the hands of local schools to fix the problems without education system and it provides them the funds they need, no strings attached, to carry out these reforms. I urge all my colleagues to stand for our kids and support this important legislation.

Mr. SANDLIN. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3248, the Dollars to the Classroom Act. The title is a misnomer. In fact, this bill takes dollars out of the classroom. Funds to the State of Texas would be reduced by \$17,592,884! I have listened to this debate and heard many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say the states are held harmless. Perhaps they're using new math, but the math I learned in school tells me that a reduction of more than \$17 million is not being held harmless.

Local control is the key. We must allow our local school districts to implement programs that are best for their communities. The federal government is and should be a junior partner in education, providing the needed tools for those programs. However, this legislation will block grant our federal education programs. This bill would eliminate many key federal elementary and secondary education programs by rolling them into a single education block grant to the states. The Eisenhower Teacher Training program, the School-to-Work program, and the voluntary Goals 2000 School Reform program would be eliminated. No federal funds would be guaranteed for programs to improve the quality of teacher training in such core subjects as reading and math. No funds would be guaranteed for programs to improve the transition from school to work. And no funds would be guaranteed to implement school reform efforts and raise academic standards.

In this bill, we see a continuation of the assault on our public schools. It is a continuation of efforts to shift federal aid away from the public schools. It is a continuation of efforts to undermine the local control of our local school districts.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have said that they want to let the teachers make the decisions. If that is so, why are teachers and other local school officials opposed to this bill? I have heard from the Texas Education Agency, Texas State Teachers Association, the Texas Federation of Teachers, the National PTA, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School

Principals, the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, the National Science Teachers Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the National Education Association. The Republicans claim that they are letting the members of these organizations make the decisions. If that is true, why are they all opposed to it?

There is nothing we do as Members of Congress that is more important than safeguarding the future of our children. We should be working to improve education, but this bill is not the way to go about it. We should be helping our local school districts with the modernization or construction of schools. We should be passing legislation to allow our local districts to hire more teachers so we can have small classes. We should be helping our local communities fund after school learning programs. We should be giving our local schools the ability to ensure that all students are computer literate and all classrooms are connected to the Internet by the year 2001.

Mr. Chairman, I challenge this body to consider and pass real education reform. Vote no on this sham of a reform.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to express my reservations about H.R. 3248, the Dollars to the Classroom Act. I take a back seat to no one in my opposition to Federal control of education. Unlike some of this bill's most vocal supporters, I have consistently voted against all appropriations for the Department of Education. In fact, when I was serving in the House in 1979, I opposed the creation of the Education Department. I applaud the work Mr. Pitts and others have done to force Congress to debate the best means of returning power over education to the states, local communities and primarily parents. However, although H.R. 3248 takes a step toward shrinking the Federal bureaucracy by repealing several education programs, its long-term effect will likely be to strengthen the Federal Government's control over education by increasing Federal spending. Therefore, Congress should reject this bill.

If H.R. 3248 did not increase Federal expenditures, my support would be unenthusiastic at best as the system of block grants established by this bill continue the unconstitutional practice of taking money from taxpayers and redistributing it to other states. The Federal Government lacks constitutional authority to carry out this type of redistribution between states and taxpayers, regardless of whether the monies are redistributed through Federal programs or through grants. There is no "block grant exception" to the principles of federalism embodied in the United States Constitution.

The requirement that the states certify that 95% of Federal monies are spent "in the classroom," (a term not defined in the act) and report to the Congress how they are using those monies to improve student performance imposes an unacceptable level of Federal management on the states. States are sovereign entities, not administrative units of the Federal Government, and should not have to account to the Federal Government for their management of educational programs.

For all its flaws, the original version of H.R. 3248 at least restored some measure of state control of education because it placed no restrictions on a state's use of funds. It was, thus, a pure block grant. However, this bill does not even give states that level of discre-

tion as H.R. 3248 has been amended to restrict the uses to which a state can apply its block grants.

Under the revised version of H.R. 3248, states can only spend their block grant money on one or more of the programs supposedly repealed by the Federal Government! In fact, this bill is merely one more example of "mandate federalism" where states are given flexibility to determine how best to fulfill goals set by Congress. Granting states the authority to select a particular form of federal management of education may be an improvement over the current system, but it is hardly a restoration of state and local control over education!

The federal government's power to treat state governments as their administrative subordinates stems from an abuse of Congress' taxing-and-spending power. Submitting to federal control is the only way state and local officials can recapture any part of the monies the federal government has illegitimately taken from a state's citizens. Of course, this is also the only way state officials can tax citizens of other states to support their education programs. It is the rare official who can afford not to bow to federal dictates in exchange for federal funding!

As long as the federal government controls education dollars, states and local schools will obey federal mandates; the core problem is not that federal monies are given with the inevitable strings attached, the real problem is the existence of federal taxation and funding.

Since federal spending is the root of federal control, by increasing federal spending this bill lays the groundwork for future Congresses to fasten more and more mandates on the states. Because state and even local officials, not federal bureaucrats, will be carrying out these mandates, this system could complete the transformation of the state governments into mere agents of the federal government.

Madam Chairman, those who doubt the likelihood of the above scenario should remember that the Education Committee could not even pass the initial block grant without "giving in" to the temptation to limit state autonomy in the use of education funds because "Congress cannot trust the states to do the right thing!" Given that this Congress cannot pass a clean block grant, who can doubt that some future Congress will decide that the States need federal "leadership" to ensure they use their block grants in the correct manner, or that states should be forced to use at least a certain percentage of their block grant funds on a few "vital" programs.

I would also ask those of my colleagues who claim that block grant will lead to future reductions in expenditures how likely is this will occur when Congress had to increase expenditures in order to originally implement the block grant programs?

Furthermore, by increasing the flow of federal money to state and local educators, rather than directly increasing parental control over education through education tax credits and tax cuts, the effect will be to make state and local officials even less responsive to parents. I wish to remind my colleagues that many state and local education officials support the same programs as the federal educators. The officials responsible for the genital exams of junior high school girls in Pennsylvania should not be rewarded with more federal taxpayers' dollars to spend as they wish.

It will be claimed that this bill does not increase spending, it merely funds education

spending at the current level by adding an adjustment to inflation to the monies appropriated for education programs in Fiscal Year 1999. However, predicting the rate of inflation is a tricky business. If, as is very likely, inflation is less than the amount dictated by this bill, the result will be an increase in education spending in real dollar terms. Still, that is beside the point, any spending increase, whether real or nominal, ought to be opposed. CBO reports that H.R. 3248 provides "additional authorization of \$9.5B."

Madam Chairman, while I applaud the attempt by the drafters of this bill to attempt to reduce the federal education bureaucracy, the fact is the Dollars to the Classroom Act represents the latest attempt of this Congress to avoid addressing philosophical and constitutional questions of the role of the Federal and State Governments by means of adjustments in management in the name of devolution. Devolution is said to be a return to state's rights since it decentralized the management of federal program; this is a new 1990's definition of the original concept of federalism and is a poor substitute for the original, constitutional definition of federalism.

Rather than shifting responsibility for the management of federal funds, Congress should defund all unconstitutional programs and dramatically cut taxes imposed upon the American people, thus enabling American families to devote more of their resources to education. I have introduced a bill, the Family Education Freedom Act (H.R. 1816) to provide parents with a \$3,000 per child tax credit for education expenses. This bill directly empowers parents, not bureaucrats or state officials, to control education and is the most important education reform idea introduced in this Congress.

In conclusion, the Dollars to the Classroom Act may repeal some unconstitutional education programs but it continues the federal government's equally unconstitutional taking of funds from the American people for the purpose of returning them in the form of monies for education only if a state obeys federal mandates. While this may be closer to the constitutional systems, it also lays the groundwork for future federal power grabs by increasing federal spending. Rather than continue to increase spending while pretending to restore federalism, Congress should take action to restore parents to the rightful place as the "bosses" of America's education system.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, Plutarch once wrote that the very spring and root of honesty and virtue lie in good education. The proposed "Dollars to the Classroom Act" would rent this spring and root from the fertile soils of our school systems and would leave only a desolate land of ignorance.

This measure attempts to tear the elementary and secondary education system apart in an effort to make political gains rather than substantive policy improvements for children and education.

H.R. 3248 would eliminate 31 existing elementary and secondary programs—including Eisenhower Professional Development, School-To-Work, Goals 2000, Comprehensive School Reform, Magnet Schools Assistance, Technology for Education, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, and Civic Education programs, among others, with no assurance that any of the funding for these programs would stay in the education arena. It seems

that we should instead name this the "Dollars FROM the Classroom Act."

This legislation would also permit all States to participate in the current Ed-Flex demonstration program without any emphasis on ensuring quality academic achievement among students.

H.R. 3248 also would eliminate the requirement that school districts with significant percentages of children in poverty be permitted to do schoolwide programs under Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

This act also errs by nullifying the accountability for taxpayer dollars that is so integral to our education system. Accountability for the Federal education dollar is extremely important in both ensuring that programs are conducted consistent with the priorities in Federal law, and that we can ensure that program dollars are being effectively utilized.

Without provisions ensuring strong accountability, we have no assurance that our nation's children are being well-served and little information on the effectiveness of our programs. Fortunately, the programs affected by this bill have existing accountability measure that ensure that resources are utilized in a manner consistent with the goals of each program and the overarching mission to educate our children.

H.R. 3248 makes only superficial attempts at ensuring accountability for the funding that would go out under the bill's block grant scheme. First, the bill requires a generic annual report on how funds have been used to improve student performance that will tell us little about effective strategies and uses of funding under the block grant.

Second, States would be required to use any measures of student academic performance to gauge the effectiveness of funding. These provisions have no requirement to link outcomes, assessments, or reporting to challenging, high quality, State academic standards and will do nothing to ensure effective use of Federal education resources.

Moreover, the Secretary of Education is specifically barred from imposing any meaningful performance or accountability standards regarding the expenditure of funding under this bill. We should not enact legislation that jeopardizes accountability of Federal dollars and, in turn, jeopardizes the quality of our children's education.

Very simply, this legislation destroys the very nature of the Federal commitment to education through a complete abandonment of accountability and a lack of focus on high student achievement, and the elimination of targeting our limited resources to those children most in need.

It is important to remember that block grants are not new. While they appeal to cries for simplification, the result has been largely to reduce funding. This approach to Federal assistance has been tried before, especially during the early 1970's and again during the early 1980's.

Specifically, in 1981, more than 40 smaller education programs were block granted. The total funding at the time was reduced because of the theory of more flexibility. Funding for the block grant decreased over time from 1982 to 1992 by roughly 52 percent.

Rather than advancing this destructive agenda, we should be advancing one which reflects the real needs of America's educational system. We need real solutions to the

demands of our education system, not divisive measures that will cause disruption.

Yet, instead of responding to the educational needs of our nation, the majority has sought to divide us along partisan lines. This does nothing to assist our principals, parents, teachers, and students in their quest for educational excellence.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3248. As a former educator in the Los Angeles Unified School District, one of the largest in this country, I cannot support this bill. It repeals 31 elementary and secondary education programs, including Goals 2000, School to Work, and Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants.

I am particularly concerned about elimination of the Eisenhower Professional Development program because it has been a successful tool in providing critical teacher training opportunities. The only way for our students to become the best they can be is for their teachers to be the best they can be—which requires on-going quality training for teachers. In this rapidly changing world, it is essential for teachers to have up-to-date training and the latest information and technology if they are to teach our children and prepare them for the next millennium.

This bill eliminates existing mechanisms that assure that federal funds are used as intended and that children are well served—yet it fails to provide adequate replacements. This bill completely eliminates the ability of the federal government to target federal funds on poor children, and instead leaves the targeting of federal funds to the political whims of state legislatures. As a former state legislator, I know the risks of federal funding reaching the intended programs when these funds are directed to block grants for states. The Government Accounting Office has found that federal funding is more targeted to poor students than state funding in 45 of 47 states. This targeted focus of federal education dollars is intended to address national problems that are not being adequately addressed at the state and local levels.

This bill is opposed by respected educators across the country, including the National Education Association, the National PTA, the American Association of School Administrators, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the American Association of University Women.

My constituents in California, including the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, do not want to see this bill passed. Yesterday, a group of California educators, led by the President of the Los Angeles County School Board came to my office and urged me to oppose this bill. They were particularly concerned that this bill would eliminate the successful Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers. In Los Angeles, these Centers have provided vital resources to our classrooms and given teachers more tools to help our children learn to read. One of the tools in this guide, "Taking a Reading," which aids teachers in teaching our children to read. If this bill passes, my local teachers will lose this tool.

Another program that will be eliminated if this bill passes is the "We The People" program. Participants of this civic education program in the 37th District of California have called my office and urged opposition to this bill. Even though we have a strong and active

program in Southern California, local leaders say the program is enhanced because of the national network they participate in through the existing federal funding. I must ask my colleagues, with all we have witnessed this summer, how can we in good faith, vote to eliminate funding for civics education for America's children? If anything, we should be providing more resources for programs that teach our children about responsible and good citizenship.

This bill also eliminates funding for Women's Educational Equity, Arts in Education and Magnet Schools, just to name a few. This is not a good bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and support real efforts to improve education, like improving teacher training, reducing class size, adding new qualified teachers, and improving the condition of our school facilities. Vote "no" on this bill.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the substitute amendment to this bill. This legislation, of which I am an original cosponsor, would hire 100,000 new teachers and reduce class size in my state in grades 1 through 3 to an average of 18 students. This amendment puts the focus in our education system back where it belongs, with our children.

This issue is raised so often by the families in my district, and I believe that we here in Congress have the responsibility to provide for our children and help localities provide the kind of education they expect and our children need to be competitive in the modern world. Studies have shown that strong reading skills at a young age lead to greater success later on. This amendment will give our teachers the ability to dedicate more of their time to working with each individual child, providing more focus on the development of this important skills.

This legislation is already funded in the President's budget proposal. This bill, too, would mean more dollars for my home state. For Connecticut, this means more than \$115 million to help local school districts hire and train additional teachers. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and give our communities the resources they need to prepare our children for the future.

Mr. CANNON. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3248, The Dollars to the Classroom Act in my home state of Utah we have a strong public education system with many successful programs. The teachers and administrators at the local level are what has made these programs work so well. They know our children, they know their names, they know their needs. They should not be superseded by a federal program handed down by Washington, D.C. We need to give our nation's teachers the power to make our children's education successful.

This bill will do that.

H.R. 3248 mandates that 95 percent of the money appropriated under this grant is to be used as we intend it to be used, in our children's classrooms. This bill combines 31 separate programs, eliminates the bureaucracy that administers those programs and makes sure that the money doesn't go to special interest groups. Our children will instead get \$2.74 billion in additional federal funding. That is \$425 per classroom. What teacher couldn't use an additional \$425 to improve the quality of education in their classrooms?

This is money that our children's teachers and local officials will be deciding how to

spend, not some special interest group or bureaucrat sitting not far from here. The money can be used to purchase supplies, buy computers, pay for Internet access, hire new teachers and increase teachers' salaries.

Our nation's teachers are molding the world leaders of tomorrow. They know our children's strengths and their weaknesses. No one influences our children like their teachers. Let's give them the power and resources to do their job right.

Mr. VENTO. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today in opposition to the block grant, H.R. 3248. As a former educator, I am a strong supporter of legislation which invests in the education of our children. However, this legislation, despite its name, does nothing to improve educational opportunities.

Federal aid was originally adopted because individual states were either unwilling or unable to meet specific needs in our schools and often to address and encourage service to special needs. H.R. 3248 fails to guarantee that any federal money would be used to continue initiatives which provide our children with the best opportunities to succeed and especially children with disabilities who deserve the opportunity and assurance with the chance to succeed. Instead, it dilutes the impact of federal funding, shortchanges high need students, reduces accountability and undermines national education priorities. And discards programs and commitments that work.

Supporters of this legislation insist that this block grant provides the perfect vehicle to get more dollars to disadvantaged children and their teachers. In fact, the very opposite is true. H.R. 3248 contains no state to local formula, leaving up to 95% of the funds to be spent at the sole discretion of the governor who incidentally isn't responsible for raising such funds. Funds could be spent on equipment, operating expenses and personnel. Federal dollars could become nothing more than general aid or tax relief for communities who do not wish to invest in important programs which address the needs of disabled, gifted, minority and disadvantaged youth the populist sentiment in the state would surely erode help for those children and families that have little political power. This block grant ignores the needs of preschool children by funding only activities and services for children aged 5 through 17, even if local officials wish to continue preschool activities.

In addition, this legislation proves for no accountability. The Block Grant Act requires only that each state submit an annual report that describes how the funds have been used to improve student performance, using any measures the state deems appropriate. Block grants are difficult to evaluate in terms of their impact on teaching and learning, and this legislation would essentially allow states to create their own standards. In a worst case scenario, they may even choose not to include data which measures the performance of students with lower

achievement levels. These children could be completely cast aside, because states will no longer have to comply with the current regulations we have in place to protect them.

Block grants for education will likely go into atrophy, as it is far easier for the National Congress to cut non-specific programs and shrink the block grant to a shadow of its \$125.

Rather than continuously undermining public education, Congress needs to take proactive measures which will bring more resources into our schools. The Republican majority continues to craft schemes which siphon money away from important programs. Instead of putting the education of children with various needs in jeopardy, we should work to ensure that every child is given the chance to partake in a quality learning environment which allows them the best opportunity to acquire skills necessary to be successful in the future. The Block Grant Act does not promote a reasonable or adequate approach to ensuring that this occurs. I oppose this legislation, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Madam Chairman, with the dawn of a new century imminently upon us, there's a great deal that's going right about America. Our economy is the envy of the world. Unemployment and inflation are both down. It is clear that the economic political message of President Ronald Reagan has been internalized, to a greater or lesser extent, by everyone in the political system.

Yet amid this economic prosperity, the education and future of our children is in doubt. As a nation, we have not lived up to our responsibility of educating our children, and our public school system is simply not competitive with the OECD nations with which we do battle in the marketplace.

We desperately need to ensure that our children in school today grow up to be the best educated young adults in the world. While school choice and government scholarship programs is the single best way to achieve this goal, the best interim measure that we can do is to decentralize our public educational system.

We need to devolve educational resources from the federal to the state level. We need to give the governors and state legislators the resources they so desperately need in order to creatively deal with the educational challenges at the local level in their communities.

The bureaucratic waste in educational programs at the Federal level is enormous. Currently, there are 788 programs originating in Washington which are supposedly meant to augment education. These programs span 39 different federal departments and consumes \$100 billion a year. Can you imagine what governors and legislators could do if \$100 billion was block-granted to the states? That's over \$2000 per student annually.

H.R. 3248, the Dollars to the Classrooms Act, is a modest yet concrete step towards reaching this necessary and justified goal. It consolidates 31, or about 4% of the 788 Federal education programs currently in existence. This will free up about \$2.74 billion in federal tax dollars, which will be transferred and sends the money in a block to the States. This "Dollars to the Classroom" bill is the first step

towards ensuring that a full 95% of our Federal education dollars bypass the bureaucracy in Washington entirely, and go directly to the classroom level, where they can help school age children the best.

In short, I urge you to give our children the resources they need and lend your support to H.R. 3248.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Chairman, I rise today to urge support of H.R. 3248, the Dollars to the Classroom Act. I commend the sponsor, Mr. PITTS, Chairman GOODLING and the Education and the Workforce Committee, for their continual hard work to ensure that real reform occurs in our nation's education system.

Madam Chairman, this legislation sends more dollars to the classrooms while giving local educators more funding options. It is currently estimated that only 65 percent of all federal funds allocated for education actually reach our nation's classrooms. This town is notorious for talking about reforming the education system but this dismal statistic proves that nothing has been accomplished.

The Dollars to the Classroom Act 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 out-score, out-perform and out-compete the students of every other nation in the world.

It's time to put our children before bureaucrats. The decision of how our education money is spent must be made by local teachers, administrators and parents. Not the federal government. It's time that we invest more wisely. We must spend our education dollars where they can achieve the most—right in the classroom.

This legislation would mean that schools in Cape Girardeau, West Plains, Rolla and every other school in Southern Missouri would receive \$9,300 on average and each classroom would receive \$425. At Dexter High School in my district, where I have taught a few classes, \$9,300 is the difference between having computers and much newer books and other much needed learning resources. It's finally time for Congress to take a stand and do what is right for our nation's children. I urge my colleagues to support Dexter High School and support the Dollars to the Classroom Act. We must localize education not nationalize it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered as having been read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3248

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Dollars to the Classroom Act".

TITLE I—IMPROVEMENT OF CLASSROOM SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. GRANTS TO STATES.

The Secretary is authorized to award grants in accordance with this title to States for use by

States and local educational agencies to improve classroom services and activities for students.

SEC. 102. GRANT AWARD.

(a) **RESERVATION OF FUNDS.**—From the amount appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve—

(1) $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent for the outlying areas, to be distributed among the outlying areas on the basis of their relative need, as determined by the Secretary in accordance with the purposes of this section; and

(2) $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent for the Secretary of the Interior for programs under this title in schools operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(b) **STATE ALLOCATIONS.**—Funds appropriated to carry out this title for any fiscal year, which are not reserved under subsection (a), shall be allocated among the States as follows:

(1) **HOLD HARMLESS.**—If the amount of funds appropriated to carry out this title in any fiscal year equals or exceeds the aggregate amount all States received in fiscal year 1998 under—

(A) title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5881 et seq.);

(B) section 1002(g)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6302(g));

(C) section 1502 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6492);

(D) part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6641 et seq.);

(E) section 3132 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6842 et seq.);

(F) title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7311 et seq.); and

(G) part B of title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11421 et seq.).

as such provisions were in effect on the day preceding the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall allocate to each State the aggregate amount such State received for fiscal year 1998 under such provisions.

(2) **INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.**—If the amount of appropriations to carry out this title for any fiscal year is insufficient to pay the full amounts that all States are eligible to receive under paragraph (1) for such year, the Secretary shall ratably reduce such amounts for such year.

(3) **REMAINING FUNDS.**—If funds remain after meeting the requirements of paragraph (1), such remaining funds shall be allocated among the States in the following manner:

(A) 50 percent of such remaining funds shall be allocated to States in proportion to their grants under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the preceding fiscal year; and

(B) 50 percent of such remaining funds shall be allocated to States in proportion to the number of children ages 5 through 17, inclusive, according to the most recent available data that are satisfactory to the Secretary.

(c) **DEFINITION OF STATE.**—For purposes of this section, the term "State" includes the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(d) **DEFINITION OF OUTLYING AREA.**—For purposes of this section, the term "outlying area" includes American Samoa, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(e) **PAYMENTS.**—Funds awarded to a State under this section shall be paid to the individual or entity in the State that is responsible for the State administration of Federal education funds pursuant to State law.

(f) **USE OF STATE AWARDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From the amount made available to a State under subsection (b) for a fiscal year, the State—

(A) shall use not more than 5 percent of the total amount to support programs or activities,

for children ages 5 through 17, that the State determines appropriate, of which the State shall distribute 20 percent of the 5 percent to local educational agencies in the State to pay the administrative expenses of the local educational agencies that are associated with the activities and services assisted under this section; and

(B) shall distribute, pursuant to section 103(a), not less than 95 percent of the amount to local educational agencies in the State for the fiscal year to enable the local educational agencies to pay the costs of activities or services provided in the classroom, for children ages 5 through 17, that the local educational agencies determine appropriate subject to the requirements of section 103(b).

(2) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—For the purpose of paragraph (1)(B), the costs of activities and services provided in the classroom exclude the administrative expenses associated with the activities and services.

(g) **SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.**—A State or local educational agency shall use funds received under this title only to supplement the amount of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for the education of pupils participating in programs assisted under this title, and not to supplant such funds.

(h) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each State receiving assistance under this part shall issue a report on an annual basis, not later than April 1 of each year beginning the year after the date of the enactment of this Act, to the Secretary, the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives that describes how funds under this title have been used to improve student performance in that State.

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—The report must also include a certification by the State that 95 percent of funding provided under this title during the preceding fiscal year has been expended by local educational agencies within that State for classroom activities and services pursuant to subsection (f)(1)(B).

(3) **MEASURES OF PERFORMANCE.**—In determining student academic performance within the State, the State shall use such measures of student academic performance as it deems appropriate. The State may disaggregate data by poverty, subject area, race, gender, geographic location, or other criteria as the State deems appropriate.

(4) **AVAILABILITY OF REPORT.**—Each State shall make the report described in this subsection available to parents and members of the public throughout that State.

SEC. 103. LOCAL AWARDS.

(a) **DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The individual or entity in the State that is responsible for the State administration of Federal education funds pursuant to State law of each State receiving assistance under this title, in consultation with the Governor of such State, the chief State school officer of such State, representatives from the State legislature, and representatives from local educational agencies within such State, shall develop a formula for the allocation of funds described in section 102, to local educational agencies, taking into consideration—

(A) poverty rates within each local educational agency;

(B) children living in sparsely populated areas;

(C) an equitable distribution of funds among urban, rural, and suburban areas;

(D) children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child; and

(E) such other factors as considered appropriate.

(2) **HOLD HARMLESS.**—No local educational agency shall receive an award under this sub-

section for any fiscal year in an amount that is less than the amount the local educational agency received to carry out programs or activities for fiscal year 1998 for title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5881 et seq.), part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6641 et seq.), section 3132 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6842 et seq.), title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7311 et seq.), and part B of title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11421 et seq.) as in effect on the day preceding the date of the enactment of this Act plus amounts the local educational agency is eligible to receive during fiscal years 1999 through 2003 pursuant to all multiyear awards made prior to the date of enactment of this Act under any program that is repealed by section 107 that is not listed in this sentence.

(3) **INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.**—If the amount allocated to a State to carry out this title for any fiscal year is insufficient to pay the full amounts that all local educational agencies in such State are eligible to receive under paragraph (2) for such year, the State shall ratably reduce such amounts for such year.

(b) **LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.**—Funds made available under this section to a local educational agency shall be used for the following classroom services and activities:

(1) Programs for the acquisition and use of instructional and educational materials, including library services and materials (including media materials), assessments, reference materials, and other curricular materials which are tied to high academic standards and which will be used to improve student achievement and which are part of an overall education reform program.

(2) Professional development for instructional staff.

(3) Programs to improve the higher order thinking skills of disadvantaged elementary and secondary school students and to prevent students from dropping out of school.

(4) Efforts to lengthen the school day or the school year.

(5) Programs to combat illiteracy in the student population.

(6) Programs to provide for the educational needs of gifted and talented children.

(7) Promising education reform projects that are tied to State student content and performance standards.

(8) Carrying out comprehensive school reform programs that are based on reliable research.

(9) Programs for homeless children and youth.

(10) Programs that are built upon partnerships between local educational agencies and institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, libraries, businesses, regional educational laboratories, or other educational entities, for the purpose of providing educational services consistent with this section.

(11) The acquisition of books, materials and equipment, payment of compensation of instructional staff, and instructional activities that are necessary for the conduct of programs in magnet schools.

(12) Programs to promote academic achievement among women and girls.

(13) Programs to provide for the educational needs of children with limited English proficiency or who are American Indian, Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian.

(14) Activities to provide the academic support, enrichment, and motivation to enable all students to reach high State standards.

(15) Efforts to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio.

(16) Projects and programs which assure the participation in mainstream settings in arts and education programs of individuals with disabilities.

(17) Projects and programs to integrate arts education into the regular elementary and secondary school curriculum.

(18) Programs designed to educate students about the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of

Rights, and to foster civic competence and responsibility.

(19) Mathematics and science education instructional materials.

(20) Programs designed to improve the quality of student writing and learning and the teaching of writing as a learning process.

(21) Technology related to the implementation of school-based reform programs, including professional development to assist teachers and other school officials regarding how to effectively use such equipment and software.

(22) Computer software and hardware for instructional use.

(23) Developing, adapting, or expanding existing and new applications of technology.

(24) Acquiring connectivity linkages, resources, and services, including the acquisition of hardware and software, for use by teachers, students, and school library media personnel in the classroom or in school library media centers, in order to improve student learning.

(25) After-school programs designed to engage children in a constructive manner and to promote their academic, developmental, and personal growth;

(26) Developing, constructing, acquiring, maintaining, operating, and obtaining technical assistance in the use of telecommunications audio and visual facilities and equipment for use in the classroom.

(27) Developing, acquiring, and obtaining technical assistance in the use of educational and instructional video programming for use in the classroom.

(c) **PARENT INVOLVEMENT.**—Each local educational agency receiving assistance under this section shall involve parents and members of the public in planning for the use of funds provided under this section.

SEC. 104. PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN ENROLLED IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

Each local educational agency that receives funds under this title shall provide for the participation of children enrolled in private schools, and their teachers or other educational personnel, in the activities and services assisted under such section in the same manner as private school children, and their teachers or other educational personnel, participate in activities and services under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) pursuant to sections 14503, 14504, 14505, and 14506 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 8893, 8894, 8895, and 8896).

SEC. 105. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “local educational agency” has the meaning given the term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801);

(2) the term “educational service agency” has the meaning given the term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801);

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Education; and

(4) except as otherwise provided, the term “State” means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

SEC. 106. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to require, direct, or control a State, local educational agency or school’s specific instructional content of pupil performance standards and assessments, curriculum, or program of instruction as a condition of eligibility to receive funds under this title.

(b) **STATE AND LOCAL DETERMINATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall not issue any regulation regarding the type of classroom

activities or services that may be assisted under this title.

(2) **INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD AND SETTING.**—No local educational agency shall be required to provide services under this title through a particular instructional method or in a particular instructional setting in order to receive funding under this title.

SEC. 107. REPEALS.

The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5881 et seq.).

(2) Title IV of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5911 et seq.).

(3) Title VI of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5951).

(4) Titles II, III, and IV of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 6121 et seq., 6171 et seq., and 6191 et seq.).

(5) Section 1502 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6492).

(6) Section 1503 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6493).

(7) Section 1002(g)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(8) Part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6621 et seq.).

(9) Part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6641 et seq.).

(10) Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.).

(11) Part A of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7201 et seq.).

(12) Part B of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7231 et seq.).

(13) Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7311 et seq.).

(14) Part B of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.).

(15) Part C of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7931 et seq.).

(16) Part A of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.).

(17) Part B of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8031 et seq.).

(18) Part D of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8091 et seq.).

(19) Part F of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8141 et seq.).

(20) Part G of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8161 et seq.).

(21) Part I of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8241 et seq.).

(22) Part J of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8271 et seq.).

(23) Part K of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8331 et seq.).

(24) Part L of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8351 et seq.).

(25) Part A of title XIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.).

(26) Part C of title XIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8671 et seq.).

(27) Subtitle B of title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11421 et seq.).

SEC. 108. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, \$2,740,000,000 for fiscal year 1999; \$2,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

\$2,870,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; \$2,940,000,000 for fiscal year 2002; and \$3,001,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. EXPANSION OF ED-FLEX DEMONSTRATIONS.

(a) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary may waive any statutory or regulatory requirement applicable to any program or Act described in subsection (b) for a State educational agency, local educational agency, or school if—

(A) and only to the extent that, the Secretary determines that such requirement impedes the ability of the State, or of a local educational agency or school in the State, to carry out the State or local improvement plan;

(B) the State educational agency has waived, or agrees to waive, similar requirements of State law;

(C) in the case of a statewide waiver, the State educational agency—

(i) provides all local educational agencies and parent organizations in the State with notice and an opportunity to comment on the State educational agency’s proposal to seek a waiver; and

(ii) submits the local educational agencies’ comments to the Secretary; and

(D) in the case of a local educational agency waiver, the local educational agency provides parents, community groups, and advocacy or civil rights groups with the opportunity to comment on the proposed waiver.

(2) **APPLICATION.**—(A)(i) To request a waiver under paragraph (1), a local educational agency or school that receives funds under this title, or a local educational agency or school shall transmit an application for such a waiver to the State educational agency. The State educational agency then shall submit approved applications for waivers under paragraph (1) to the Secretary.

(ii) A State educational agency may request a waiver under paragraph (1) by submitting an application for such waiver to the Secretary.

(B) Each application submitted to the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) identify the statutory or regulatory requirements that are requested to be waived and the goals that the State educational agency or local educational agency or school intends to achieve;

(ii) describe the action that the State educational agency has undertaken to remove State statutory or regulatory barriers identified in the application of local educational agencies;

(iii) describe the goals of the waiver and the expected programmatic outcomes if the request is granted;

(iv) describe the numbers and types of students to be impacted by such waiver;

(v) describe a timetable for implementing a waiver; and

(vi) describe the process the State educational agency will use to monitor, on a biannual basis, the progress in implementing a waiver.

(3) **TIMELINESS.**—The Secretary shall act promptly on a request for a waiver under paragraph (1) and shall provide a written statement of the reasons for granting or denying such request.

(4) **DURATION.**—Each waiver under paragraph (1) shall be for a period not to exceed 4 years. The Secretary may extend such period if the Secretary determines that the waiver has been effective in enabling the State or affected local educational agencies to carry out reform plans.

(b) **INCLUDED PROGRAMS.**—The statutory or regulatory requirements subject to the waiver authority of this section are any such requirements under the following programs or Acts:

(1) Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(2) Part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(3) Part A of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(4) Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(5) Part B of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(6) The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act.

(c) **WAIVERS NOT AUTHORIZED.**—The Secretary may not waive any statutory or regulatory requirement of the programs or Acts described in subsection (b)—

(1) relating to—

(A) maintenance of effort;

(B) comparability of services;

(C) the equitable participation of students and professional staff in private schools;

(D) parental participation and involvement; and

(E) the distribution of funds to States or to local educational agencies; and

(2) unless the underlying purposes of the statutory requirements of each program or Act for which a waiver is granted continue to be met to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

(d) **TERMINATION OF WAIVERS.**—The Secretary shall periodically review the performance of any State, local educational agency, or school for which the Secretary has granted a waiver under subsection (a)(1) and shall terminate the waiver if the Secretary determines that the performance of the State, the local educational agency, or the school in the area affected by the waiver has been inadequate to justify a continuation of the waiver.

(e) **FLEXIBILITY DEMONSTRATION.**—

(1) **SHORT TITLE.**—This subsection may be cited as the "Education Flexibility Partnership Demonstration Act".

(2) **PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out an education flexibility demonstration program under which the Secretary authorizes not more than 50 State educational agencies serving eligible States to waive statutory or regulatory requirements applicable to 1 or more programs or Acts described in subsection (b), other than requirements described in subsection (c), for the State educational agency or any local educational agency or school within the State.

(B) **AWARD RULE.**—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall select for participation in the demonstration program described in subparagraph (A) three State educational agencies serving eligible States that each have a population of 3,500,000 or greater and three State educational agencies serving eligible States that each have a population of less than 3,500,000, determined in accordance with the most recent decennial census of the population performed by the Bureau of the Census.

(C) **DESIGNATION.**—Each eligible State participating in the demonstration program described in subparagraph (A) shall be known as an "Ed-Flex Partnership State".

(3) **ELIGIBLE STATE.**—For the purpose of this subsection the term "eligible State" means a State that waives State statutory or regulatory requirements relating to education while holding local educational agencies or schools within the State that are affected by such waivers accountable for the performance of the students who are affected by such waivers.

(4) **STATE APPLICATION.**—(A) Each State educational agency desiring to participate in the education flexibility demonstration program under this subsection shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. Each such application shall demonstrate that the eligible State has adopted an educational flexibility plan for the State that includes—

(i) a description of the process the State educational agency will use to evaluate applications from local educational agencies or schools requesting waivers of—

(I) Federal statutory or regulatory requirements described in paragraph (2)(A); and

(II) State statutory or regulatory requirements relating to education; and

(ii) a detailed description of the State statutory and regulatory requirements relating to education that the State educational agency will waive.

(B) The Secretary may approve an application described in subparagraph (A) only if the Secretary determines that such application demonstrates substantial promise of assisting the State educational agency and affected local educational agencies and schools within such State in carrying out comprehensive educational reform, after considering—

(i) the comprehensiveness and quality of the educational flexibility plan described in subparagraph (A);

(ii) the ability of such plan to ensure accountability for the activities and goals described in such plan;

(iii) the significance of the State statutory or regulatory requirements relating to education that will be waived; and

(iv) the quality of the State educational agency's process for approving applications for waivers of Federal statutory or regulatory requirements described in paragraph (2)(A) and for monitoring and evaluating the results of such waivers.

(5) **LOCAL APPLICATION.**—(A) Each local educational agency or school requesting a waiver of a Federal statutory or regulatory requirement described in paragraph (2)(A) and any relevant State statutory or regulatory requirement from a State educational agency shall submit an application to the State educational agency at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the State educational agency may reasonably require. Each such application shall—

(i) indicate each Federal program affected and the statutory or regulatory requirement that will be waived;

(ii) describe the purposes and overall expected results of waiving each such requirement;

(iii) describe for each school year specific, measurable, educational goals for each local educational agency or school affected by the proposed waiver; and

(iv) explain why the waiver will assist the local educational agency or school in reaching such goals.

(B) A State educational agency shall evaluate an application submitted under subparagraph (A) in accordance with the State's educational flexibility plan described in paragraph (4)(A).

(C) A State educational agency shall not approve an application for a waiver under this paragraph unless—

(i) the local educational agency or school requesting such waiver has developed a local reform plan that is applicable to such agency or school, respectively; and

(ii) the waiver of Federal statutory or regulatory requirements described in paragraph (2)(A) will assist the local educational agency or school in reaching its educational goals.

(6) **MONITORING.**—Each State educational agency participating in the demonstration program under this subsection shall annually monitor the activities of local educational agencies and schools receiving waivers under this subsection and shall submit an annual report regarding such monitoring to the Secretary.

(7) **DURATION OF FEDERAL WAIVERS.**—(A) The Secretary shall not approve the application of a State educational agency under paragraph (4) for a period exceeding 5 years, except that the Secretary may extend such period if the Secretary determines that such agency's authority to grant waivers has been effective in enabling such State or affected local educational agencies or schools to carry out their local reform plans.

(B) The Secretary shall periodically review the performance of any State educational agency granting waivers of Federal statutory or regulatory requirements described in paragraph (2)(A) and shall terminate such agency's au-

thority to grant such waivers if the Secretary determines, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that such agency's performance has been inadequate to justify continuation of such authority.

(f) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—In deciding whether to extend a request for a waiver under subsection (a)(1), or a State educational agency's authority to issue waivers under subsection (e), the Secretary shall review the progress of the State educational agency, local educational agency, or school affected by such waiver or authority to determine if such agency or school has made progress toward achieving the desired results described in the application submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(B)(iii) or (e)(5)(A)(ii).

(g) **PUBLICATION.**—A notice of the Secretary's decision to grant waivers under subsection (a)(1) and to authorize State educational agencies to issue waivers under subsection (e) shall be published in the Federal Register and the Secretary shall provide for the dissemination of such notice to State educational agencies, interested parties, including educators, parents, students, advocacy and civil rights organizations, other interested parties, and the public.

SEC. 202. EXPANSION OF SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAMS.

Section 1114(a)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6314) is amended by striking "if, for the initial year of the schoolwide program" and all that follows through the end and inserting a period.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 105-726.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment number 1 printed in House Report 105-726.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 105-726 offered by Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 543, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to include the Alaska Native Education Act.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The inclusion of the Native American in Alaska and Hawaii in this list of 31 programs that are to be block granted is wholly inappropriate and basically inexplicable. The whole purpose of this list, as I have been able to rationalize it, is that presumably those programs were to have some national perspective and, therefore, lumping all of the monies in these programs into one block grant and allowing the States to make a decision as to which ones they wanted funded was the purpose of the legislation.

Unfortunately, in drafting the list of 31 programs, the majority included the Alaska Native Education Program and the Hawaii Native Education Act. And it makes no sense, because these two programs are designated specifically for the Native American population in these two States. To take the monies away from this program and put it into a block grant making the total dollars available for the entire Nation and sacrificing these two designated programs is absolutely untenable.

The Native Hawaiian Education Act was established by Congress in 1988 and it was part of the Federal Government's assumption of responsibility for the Native Americans that were in the State of Hawaii. That was true also for the Alaskan native peoples as well.

The program is comprised of 6 programs and is funded in fiscal year 1998 at \$18 million. To completely obliterate this special funding denies my State and the Native American population in my State of \$18 million and puts this whole funding into a national pot.

Notwithstanding what the majority has been saying about the funding, I have been advised that if this bill is enacted into law, that my State will lose 67 percent of the funding based upon the current level of funding in our programs, and Alaska will lose 52 percent, and we are the two States with the highest loss. That is directly attributable to the loss of this specific funding, which we would otherwise be entitled to receive.

The Congress has a unique responsibility to Native Americans. There are no other Native American programs that are included in the 31 that are being eliminated, except for Hawaii and Alaska. It is a basic failure to understand the purpose and policies that were behind the enactment of these special laws.

The Native Hawaiian Education Act is an acknowledgment of the Federal Government's responsibility for the improvement of the quality of education, the quality of health and other areas of our native population.

Therefore, I hope that this House will recognize the uniqueness of these two programs and support the amendment that I have offered.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), our leader.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the committee, for yielding me time on this very important amendment offered by our good friend from Hawaii.

About four years ago I offered an amendment on this floor during the appropriations process to eliminate this \$5 million program called the Native Hawaiian Education program, intended to provide some money to help in the education of native Hawaiian children. The reason for that is very simple. In Hawaii there is the Bishop estate left by the heir to King Kamehameha and this Bishop estate has a \$10 billion endowment. That is \$10 billion.

Their sole purpose, their sole charter is to educate native Hawaiian children.

This estate has squandered this money for a number of years to the point where the school that receives this funding of the amendment offered by my friend from Hawaii, this school is being investigated by the Attorney General in the State of Hawaii. The school is being audited, investigated by the Internal Revenue Service. The trustees of this Bishop estate are paid, in 1996, \$843,109, \$843,000 to each trustee, more than what most CEOs in America are paid.

I think the Bishop estate has its own series of problems. The Clinton administration, in 1997, zero funded this same program because they said that the services provided by the special \$5 million grant were already covered under other programs that these children would qualify for.

This is nothing more than \$5 million worth of extra pork intended to go to one State. It is unnecessary, and the amendment should absolutely be defeated.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Madam Chairman, it is very difficult to talk about the amendment which we have in front of us when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has brought up an entirely extraneous point.

I hope the chairman will recognize this stuff and that this has nothing to do with the amendment. The estate that he is talking about is involved with a private school. We are talking about public funds here that go to public schools. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Bishop estate, with the Kamehameha school. None of this money goes to that school or to the estate.

This is a completely extraneous issue, and I beg the Members, please, not to be, I will say misled, because maybe the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) has a misconception. I would be happy to discuss it with him at some other point. Our amendment has to do with this block grant proposal. I

indicated to the chairman yesterday and to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) that we were not arguing with the block grant proposal. That is an argument for another day.

What we are saying is that we will be eliminated. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) himself used the word "eliminate" because that was the object. We would be eliminated, as would the native Alaskans. So all we are asking for is consideration, not an exception but consideration to be included. If this amendment does not pass, the likelihood of our being able to be included in the block grant in any way that would allow us to adequately participate in any of these programs is virtually eliminated.

I beg the Members, we can argue at length, and I would be happy to do it, not argue but discuss at length the efficacy of the gentleman from Ohio's (Mr. BOEHNER) remarks in another context. But with this particular amendment, I urge with all the sincerity that I can that we not confuse the issue of the public schools, the money to go to children that would otherwise not necessarily have the opportunity if the amendment does not pass.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Because I have the greatest admiration and respect for the gentlewoman from Hawaii and because I enjoy her company, publicly, that is, better make that clear, I am going to ask everyone to vote no on her amendment.

Why would I do that if I have that much respect for her? Because I want to give her more than 18 million to spend. At the present time she can only spend 18 million on her program, only 18 million. With this program that we are offering, she can spend the total, the total allocation of all of these programs on that one specific program.

Now, I am sure that the State of Hawaii will not neglect their obligation to native Hawaiians. In fact, she assured me that would not happen. So I want Members to vote no on the gentlewoman's amendment because I want her to be able to spend more than 18 million, and the only way she can do that is if we defeat her amendment and pass the underlying legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote and, pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 543, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 105-726.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MARTINEZ

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 105-726 offered by Mr. MARTINEZ:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND FINDINGS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Class-Size Reduction and Teacher Quality Act of 1998".

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Rigorous research has shown that students attending small classes in the early grades make more rapid educational progress than students in larger classes, and that these achievement gains persist through at least the elementary grades.

(2) The benefits of smaller classes are greatest for lower-achieving, minority, poor, and inner-city children. One study found that urban fourth-graders in smaller-than-average classes were three-quarters of a school year ahead of their counterparts in larger-than-average classes.

(3) Teachers in small classes can provide students with more individualized attention, spend more time on instruction and less on other tasks, and cover more material effectively, and are better able to work with parents to further their children's education.

(4) Smaller classes allow teachers to identify and work more effectively with students who have learning disabilities and, potentially, can reduce those students' need for special education services in the later grades.

(5) Students in smaller classes are able to become more actively engaged in learning than their peers in large classes.

(6) Efforts to improve educational achievement by reducing class sizes in the early grades are likely to be more successful if well-prepared teachers are hired and appropriately assigned to fill additional classroom positions and if teachers receive intensive, continuing training in working effectively in smaller classroom settings.

(7) Several States have begun a serious effort to reduce class sizes in the early elementary grades, but these actions may be impeded by financial limitations or difficulties in hiring well-prepared teachers.

(8) The Federal Government can assist in this effort by providing funding for class-size reductions in grades one through three, and by helping to ensure that the new teachers brought into the classroom are well prepared.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to help States and local educational agencies recruit, train, and hire 100,000 additional teachers over a seven-year period in order to—

(1) reduce class sizes nationally, in grades 1 through 3, to an average of 18 students per classroom; and

(2) improve teaching in the early grades so that all students can learn to read independently and well by the end of the third grade.

SEC. 3. PROGRAM FUNDING.

For the purpose of carrying out this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated \$1,100,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, \$1,300,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, \$1,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$1,700,000,000 for fiscal year 2002,

\$1,735,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$2,300,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, and \$2,800,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2005 through 2008.

SEC. 4. ALLOCATIONS TO STATES.

(a) **RESERVATION FOR EVALUATION.**—From the amount appropriated pursuant to section 3 for each fiscal year, the Secretary may reserve up to \$2 million to carry out the evaluation described in section 13.

(b) **RESERVATION FOR THE OUTLYING AREAS AND THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.**—Of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 3 for each fiscal year and remaining after any reservation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall reserve a total of not more than 1 percent to make payments, on the basis of their respective needs, to—

(1) American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands for activities, approved by the Secretary, consistent with this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of the Interior for activities, approved by the Secretary, consistent with this Act in schools operated or supported by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(c) **ALLOCATIONS TO STATES.**—(1) After reserving funds under subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall allocate to each State an amount that bears the same relationship to the remaining amount as the amount of funding the State received under section 1122 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the previous fiscal year bore to the total amount available for allocation under that section.

(2) If any State chooses not to participate in the program under this Act, or fails to submit an approvable application, the Secretary shall reallocate its allocation to the remaining States, in accordance with paragraph (1).

SEC. 5. APPLICATIONS.

(a) **APPLICATION REQUIRED.**—The State educational agency of each State desiring to receive a grant under this Act shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Each application shall include—

(1) the State's goals for using funds under this Act to reduce average class sizes in regular classrooms in grades 1 through 3, including—

(A) a description of current regular classroom class sizes in the local educational agencies of the State;

(B) a description of the State's plan for using funds under this Act to reduce the average class size in regular classrooms in those grades; and

(C) the regular classroom class-size goals the State intends to reach and a justification for those goals;

(2) a description of the State educational agency's plan for allocating program funds within the State, including—

(A) an estimate of the impact of those allocations on class sizes in the individual local educational agencies of the State;

(B) an assurance that the State educational agency will make this plan public within the State; and

(C) a description of the current and projected capacity of the State's school facilities to accommodate reduced class sizes;

(3) a description of the State educational agency's strategy for improving teacher quality in grades 1 through 3 within the State (which may be part of a broader strategy to improve teacher quality generally), including—

(A) the actions it will take to ensure the availability, within the State, of a pool of well-prepared, certified teachers to fill the positions created with funds under this Act; and

(B) a description of how the State educational agency and the local educational agencies in the State will ensure that—

(i) individuals hired for positions created with program funds (which may include individuals who have pursued "alternative routes" to certification) will meet all of the State's current requirements for full certification, or will be making satisfactory progress toward achieving full certification within three years;

(ii) teachers in first through third grade will be prepared to teach reading effectively to all children, including those with special needs, and will take part in continuing professional development in effective reading instruction and in teaching effectively in small classes; and

(iii) individuals hired as beginning teachers in first through third grade will be required to pass a teacher competency test selected by the State;

(4) a description of how the State will use other funds, including other Federal funds, to improve teacher quality and reading achievement within the State;

(5) a description of how the State will hold local educational agencies that use a significant portion of their allocations under section 8(a)(2)(B) accountable for that use of funds;

(6) an assurance that the local educational agency and its schools will comply with the requirements of subsections (a) and (b) of section 11; and

(7) an assurance that the State educational agency will submit such reports and information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(c) **APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.**—The Secretary shall approve a State's application if it meets the requirements of this section and holds reasonable promise of achieving the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. WITHIN-STATE ALLOCATIONS.

(a) **STATE-LEVEL EXPENSES.**—Each State may use not more than a total of one-half of one percent of the amount it receives under this part for any fiscal year or \$50,000, whichever is greater, for the administration costs of the State educational agency and for State-level activities described in section 7.

(b) **SUBGRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.**—(1) Each State shall use the remainder of its allocation to make subgrants to local educational agencies, for the purpose of reducing class size and improving instruction in grades 1 through 3, on the basis of—

(A) current or projected regular classroom class sizes in grades 1 through 3 in those agencies; and

(B) the relative ability and effort of those agencies to finance class-size reductions with their own funds.

(2) Each State shall make the allocations described in paragraph (1) in such manner as to enable local educational agencies to reduce their average class sizes in regular classrooms, in grades 1 through 3, to the average class size proposed in the State application.

(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), each State shall ensure, in allocating funds under this subsection, that each local educational agency in which at least 30 percent of the children are from low-income families, or in which there are at least 10,000 children from such families, receives at least the same share of those funds as it received of the State's allocation under section 1122 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the preceding fiscal year.

(c) **MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.**—(1) A local educational agency may receive an allocation under this section for any fiscal year only if it submits to, or has on file with, the

State educational agency an assurance that it will spend at least as much from non-Federal sources as it spent in the previous year for the combination of—

(A) teachers in regular classrooms in grades 1 through 3 in schools receiving benefits under this Act; and

(B) the quality-improvement activities described in section 8(b).

(2) The Secretary may waive or modify the requirement of paragraph (1) for a local educational agency if the Secretary determines that doing so would be equitable due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances affecting that agency.

SEC. 7. STATE-LEVEL ACTIVITIES.

East State educational agency may use the funds it reserves for State-level activities under section 6(a) to carry out activities described in its application, which may include such activities as—

(1) strengthening State teacher licensure and certification standards;

(2) developing or strengthening, and administering, teacher competency tests for beginning teachers; and

(3) program monitoring and other administrative costs associated with operating the program.

SEC. 8. USES OF FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Each local educational agency shall use all funds it receives from the State under this Act, except for funds it reserves under subsection (b), to pay the salaries of, and benefits for, the additional teachers needed to reduce class sizes in grades 1 through 3 to the level set by the State as its goal in the State application.

(2) A local educational agency that has already reached this level may use those funds to—

(A) make further class-size reductions in grades 1 through 3;

(B) reduce class sizes in kindergarten or other grades; or

(C) undertake quality-improvement activities under subsection (b).

(b) QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.—(1) Each local educational agency shall use at least 10 percent of the funds it receives under this Act for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003 for activities to ensure that teachers who will teach smaller classes are prepared to teach reading and other subjects effectively in a smaller class setting.

(2) The activities described in paragraph (1) may include—

(A) training teachers in effective reading instructional practices (including practices for teaching students who experience initial difficulty in learning to read) and in effective instructional practices in small classes;

(B) paying the costs for uncertified teachers hired in grades 1 through 3 to obtain full certification within three years;

(C) providing mentors or other support for teachers in grades 1 through 3;

(D) improving recruitment of teachers for schools that have a particularly difficult time hiring certified instructors; and

(E) providing scholarships or other aid for education and education-related expenses to paraprofessionals or undergraduate students in order to expand the pool of well-prepared and certified teachers.

SEC. 9. COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.

(a) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of activities carried out under this Act may be up to 100 percent in local educational agencies with child-poverty levels greater than 40 percent, but shall be no more than—

(1) 95 percent in local educational agencies with child-poverty rates of more than 30 percent but not more than 40 percent;

(2) 85 percent in local educational agencies with child-poverty rates of more than 20 percent but not more than 30 percent;

(3) 75 percent in local educational agencies with child-poverty rates of more than 10 percent but not more than 20 percent; and

(4) 65 percent in local educational agencies with child-poverty rates of not more than 10 percent.

(b) LOCAL SHARE.—A local educational agency shall provide the non-Federal share of a project under this Act through cash expenditures from non-Federal sources, except that if an agency has allocated funds under section 1113(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to one or more schoolwide programs under section 1114 of that Act, it may use those funds for the non-Federal share of activities under this program that benefit those schoolwide programs, to the extent consistent with section 1120A(c) of that Act and notwithstanding section 1114(a)(3)(B) of that Act.

SEC. 10. CARRYOVER OF FUNDS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds received under this Act by a State or by a local educational agency shall remain available for obligation and expenditure by the State or local agency for one fiscal year beyond the fiscal year described in section 421(b) of the General Educational Provisions Act.

SEC. 11. ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) SCHOOL REPORT.—Each school benefiting from the program under this Act, or the local educational agency for that school, shall produce an annual report to parents and the general public on its student achievement in reading (using available evidence of reading achievement of its students in grades 1 through 5 and the assessments the State uses under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, disaggregated as required under that part), average class size in its regular classrooms, and teacher certification and related academic qualifications in grades 1 through 3.

(b) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY REPORTS.—(1) INTERM REPORTS.—Each local educational agency shall provide each year, to its State educational agency, a report summarizing the information reported by, or for, its schools under subsection (a).

(2) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—Within three years of receiving funding under this Act, and each year thereafter, each local educational agency shall provide evidence, to its State educational agency, of the reading achievement of its students, in grade 3, 4, or 5 in schools served under this Act, which shall be—

(A) in a form determined by the State educational agency;

(B) based on the assessments that the local educational agency is using under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, or on comparably rigorous State or local assessments; and

(C) disaggregated to show the achievement of students in individual schools and of students separately by race and by gender, as well as for students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency, migrant students, and students who are economically disadvantaged.

(c) PROGRAM-IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—A local educational agency with schools that fail to show improvement in reading achievement within three years of receiving funds under this Act shall, with the approval of the State educational agency, develop and implement a program-improvement plan to improve student performance.

(d) REDUCED LOCAL ALLOCATIONS.—If a school participating in the program under this Act fails to show improvement in reading achievement of its students within two years after the local educational agency develops a plan subsection (b), the State edu-

cational agency shall reduce the allocation to that local agency by an amount equal to the share of the local agency's allocation attributable to that school.

SEC. 12. PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE SCHOOL TEACHERS.

Each local educational agency receiving funds under this Act shall, after timely and meaningful consultation with appropriate private school officials, provide for the inclusion (in a manner proportionate to the number of children residing in the area served by the agency's project under this Act who attend private schools) of private school teachers in the professional-development activities the agency and its schools carry out with those funds.

SEC. 13. EVALUATION.

With funds reserved under section 4(a), the Secretary shall carry out an evaluation of the program authorized by this Act, including a measurement of its effectiveness in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993.

SEC. 14. WAIVERS.

The Secretary may, at the request of a State educational agency, waive or modify a requirement of this Act if the Secretary determines that such requirement impedes the ability of the State to carry out the purpose of this Act and that providing a waiver would better promote the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 15. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act, the following terms have the following meanings:

(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term "local educational agency" has the meaning given that term in section 14101(18) (A) and (B) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

(3) STATE.—The term "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 543, the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) and a Member opposed, each will control 30 minutes.

□ 1030

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) claim the time in opposition?

Mr. GOODLING. I claim the time in opposition, Madam Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) will control 30 minutes in opposition.

The gentleman from California (Mr. Martinez) is recognized.

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

The amendment I have will establish an initiative to reduce class sizes in grades 1, 2, and 3 to an average of 18 students per class by the year 2005. It would enable schools to hire over 100,000 additional teachers and would require school districts to contribute matching funds, with the amount of the match depending on the level of poverty in the district. Funds could be used to recruit, train, and pay teacher salaries of the additional teachers necessary to reduce the class size, and to ensure that all teachers are equipped with the latest and most successful instructional techniques. In ensuring

this program has strong accountability provisions, school districts would be required to demonstrate how reduced class sizes are resulting in increased student achievement.

This amendment would help make sure that every child receives personal attention, gets a solid foundation for further learning, and learns to read independently by the end of the third grade. The impact of reducing class size was highlighted in the recent report issued by the Department of Education, "Reducing Class Size: What Do We Know?" This report reached three conclusions:

Research shows that smaller classes promote student achievement in early grades. The significant effect of class size reduction on student achievement appears when class size is reduced to the point between 15 and 20 students. If class size is reduced from substantially more than 20 students per class to below 20 students, the related increase in student achievement moves the average student from the 50th percentile up to the 60th percentile. For disadvantaged minorities, the effect is even larger.

Students and teachers and parents report positive effects from the impact of class size reduction on the quality of classroom activity. Most importantly, the study shows that 25 States already have started or are considering some sort of class size reduction initiative showing how this initiative truly has widespread support.

Madam Chairman, I believe this amendment is a critically important aspect of the education reform for today's schools and urge all Members to support its adoption.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment is just the opposite of what we should be trying to do if we really are interested in reform in local school districts.

One size fits all has no place in this debate whatsoever. That has been the problem. With the money they now get, they can take it all and reduce class size. That is the beauty of this. If that is their most important initiative. But let me tell my colleagues, there had better be another initiative that is even more important, and that is teacher preparation. I do not care what size the class may be in relationship to students, if there is not a competent teacher in that classroom, it is not going to make a difference. Many sisters who taught in large classes for years will attest to that. It was the excellence of the teacher and the control of the teacher of the classroom.

So I do not want to tell somebody that they have to use this money to reduce class size. I want to tell them if that is what they want to do, that is allowable. And if they are going to prepare the teachers for those reduced classes, that is allowable. So the beau-

ty of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) is offering is the fact that it gives those local areas the opportunity to determine what they need most in order to improve education in their local area. And that is what we should be considering.

We have to forget the bureaucrats who are campaigning against any changes because of what they get as far as the bureaucracy is concerned. And many of them are private, and they still get these grants. Many of them are grants that they do not even have to compete. So, again, let us not mix apples and oranges.

We have a golden opportunity. If in our districts we want to reduce class size, we can use the money for that purpose. If we want to better prepare teachers so that they can better teach, we can use it for that. If we want to use it because the equipment and the textbooks and so on are in bad shape, it can be used for that. It can be used for a combination of things. But, please, do not come here and tell the local district one more time that we, in Washington, D.C., have all the answers and they can only use the money specifically as we say, one size fits all.

Let me close just by again reminding everyone: The money that is available here can be used for the same activities that they have been using the money for in the past. What we take away is the one size fits all, we take away the paperwork, and we give them the flexibility to determine what is most important in their local district to improve education for all children.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just comment that the gentleman has just said it: They can use the money for anything they feel like. So that if those programs that have been protected for so long by the national interest are not of vital concern to that locality, they will not use the money for it. So, in reality, the beauty of this, as they see it, is that these things may never happen.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to reduce class size and opposition to the underlying bill.

Because I wish I were as wealthy as Bill Gates does not mean I am. If I wish that I could be as great a basketball player as Michael Jordan, it does not mean I am. And this debate is not about what we wish, it is not about families. Because I even agree with the philosophy of trying to drive more dollars to our local schools and classrooms and that parents and teachers should be in charge. This debate is not about families, it is about facts. It is about where this money is and where it actually goes.

To get to the facts, with all due respect, we said, let us see how all 50 States come out of this formula from this block grant that the chairman has devised, and so we said that we would not use the chairman's number, out of all due respect, and we would not use the Department of Education numbers either, and we would not use the Democrat or Republican numbers. We went to the CRS. The Congressional Research Service is a bipartisan organization. We wanted to see what they say, with the thick glasses and the green eyeshades and pounding the statistics.

Well, here are the facts: They say 27 States lose money. Twenty-seven States lose money.

Fact one. When we send money to the State and the local schools, 27 States come out lower under this bill.

Fact two. And we all know this is a fact. We can authorize and wish and hope and pray under this committee that we are going to get this money, but when the appropriation committee cuts this money by \$550 million, a half a billion dollars cut, more States lose money.

So the fact of the matter is, my colleagues, look at the CRS money.

This is not a debate on a philosophy that I think we all disagree on: Trying to get our parents and teachers more involved in our local schools, trying to get our families more involved. It is not over promising to the parents and others that they are going to get all this money. Let us be truthful. Let us be real. Let us look at the facts.

The second point on this amendment. If we are going to make a difference in schools, it is with charter schools and public choice, it is with better trained teachers, it is with accountability and family involvement, and it is with discipline. And, with this amendment, it is with more teachers, better-trained teachers, and less children in the classroom.

This amendment, if we are going to make a difference, as this amendment does, reduces the average class size from 26 to 18. A teacher is teaching 18 children rather than 26. That is a huge difference. In Indiana, we have the Indiana prime time in first grades, where when we do this, reading scores are going up and up and up.

Let us make a difference, making the hard choices, providing more teachers and providing better ratios for our teachers in our schools. Vote for the Clay amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before yielding to my colleague from Pennsylvania, to make sure everybody understands that fact one is totally wrong. CRS has made it very clear that that is totally wrong. And, in fact, in fact one he is again mixing apples and oranges. He is talking about an appropriation bill. We do not know what the appropriation bill will be when it is completed. I will guarantee it will be more, as it always is every year.

Fact two. Completely wrong. Mixing apples and oranges, because he is talking about an appropriation bill. CRS did this very clearly, very carefully, and the State of Indiana will receive \$5,432,568 more down to the classroom to help reduce class size and to help better prepare teachers.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, again the Democrats are cooking the books. This amendment takes away the States' flexibility that we are trying to provide under our bill. It is based on the philosophy that the Federal Government knows best. The States and local districts should be making the decisions about how best to achieve the goal of improved student performance.

Under this amendment, States are allowed to use only one-half of 1 percent of their funds to carry out activities relating to improving teacher quality. At the local level such use of funds are only allowable after they have met certain specific targets in class size reduction. In effect, this amendment puts a very low priority on the importance of teacher quality and too much faith in the benefits of class size reduction.

In fact, teacher quality is more important than class size. After all, what good is a classroom of 20 or 10 or even 5 students if the teacher has no idea about the subject in which he or she is teaching? We have seen massive class size reduction efforts in several States that have led to negative impacts in certain poor and rural areas where already they are experiencing shortage of qualified teachers. A mandate that further reduces class size will, in effect, force them to hire more inexperienced and unqualified teachers with emergency license.

This amendment will only force thousands more children to be sent into trailers parked in the backs of schools. Is this what the supporters of this amendment really want? The quality of the teacher is much more important. We should emphasize that and let the local districts and the States, who understand that, have that flexibility.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Chairman, I thank the ranking member from California for yielding me this time, and would ask that Members study the CRS numbers, which I will submit for the RECORD, and see for themselves the 27 States that are cut under this funding.

I think it is very important for my colleagues to be able to see not what the Republican committee has put together, not what the Democratic administration at the Department of Education has put together, but what the nonpartisan number crunchers at CRS have put together. I would ask Members to look at the 27 States that are cut under those figures. And more States will be cut under that table when the Committee on Appropriations

follows through on a \$550 million cut in the appropriations process, when that bill comes to the floor.

Now, the committee chairman says it is apples and oranges. We all know that an authorization bill is directly tied to the appropriation bill and the appropriators determine the funding level. That is fact.

Madam Chairman, the tables I referred to above are submitted herewith:

Alaska—52.3% (\$11,395,724)
 Young
 Connecticut—8.5% (\$2,566,669)
 Shaps
 Johnson
 Delaware—13.2% (\$1,538,907)
 Castle
 D.C.—66.2% (\$19,594,406)
 Hawaii—67.5% (\$23,428,242)
 Idaho—7.8% (\$1,022,722)
 Chenoweth
 Crapo
 Iowa—39.8% (\$15,248,832)
 Leach
 Nussle
 Ganske
 Latham
 Kansas—0.6% (\$151,556)
 Moran
 Ryun
 Snowbarger
 Tiahrt
 Louisiana—5.3% (\$3,293,031)
 Livingston
 Tauzin
 McCrery
 Cooksey
 Baker
 Maryland—3.7% (\$1,617,157)
 Gilchrest
 Ehrlich
 Bartlett
 Morella
 Massachusetts—10.1% (\$6,040,778)
 Montana—12.2% (\$1,590,614)
 Hill
 Nebraska—31.7% (\$6,830,260)
 Bereuter
 Christensen
 Barrett
 Nevada—2.0% (\$257,989)
 Ensign
 Gibbons
 New Hampshire—17.3% (\$2,296,611)
 Sununu
 Bass
 New Mexico—18.5% (\$4,841,853)
 Wilson
 Skeen
 Redmond
 North Dakota—22.0% (\$2,851,323)
 Oklahoma—5.5% (\$1,916,615)
 Largent
 Coburn
 Watkins
 Watts
 Istook
 Lucas
 Oregon—0.9% (\$268,893)
 Smith
 Rhode Island—29.5% (\$4,738,033)
 South Carolina—0.7% (\$242,524)
 Sanford
 Spence
 Graham
 Inglis
 South Dakota—25.9% (\$3,693,337)
 Thune
 Utah—13.1% (\$2,840,436)
 Hansen
 Cook
 Cannon
 Vermont—17.4% (\$2,075,763)
 Virginia—4.3% (\$2,241,574)
 Bateman

Goodlatte
 Bliley
 Wolf
 Davis
 Washington—16.5% (\$9,409,741)
 White
 Metcalf
 Smith
 Hastings
 Nethercutt
 Dunn
 West Virginia—10.8% (\$2,635,214)
 Wyoming—17.4% (\$2,032,323)
 Cubin

TABLE 11C.—ESTIMATED STATE ALLOCATIONS UNDER H.R. 3248, AS ORDERED TO BE REPORTED, COMPARED TO ESTIMATES PREPARED BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (ED) OF FY1998 GRANTS UNDER ALL PROGRAMS PROPOSED TO BE CONSOLIDATED UNDER H.R. 3248

[H.R. 3248 Estimates: An Amount Equal to FY1998 Allocations Under Formula Grant Programs To Be Consolidated Is First Allocated To Each State, Next, Remaining Block Grant Appropriations (Assumed To Be Equal To \$2.74 Billion Minus the Formula Grant Portion) Are Allocated With 50% In Proportion To ESEA Title I, Part A Grants And 50% In Proportion To Population Aged 5–17. Grants Are Estimated At The Maximum Authorized Level For FY1999.]

[ED Estimates of FY1998 Grants: Include Actual Or Projected Grants Under All Programs Proposed To Be Consolidated. For Grants to Entities That Provide Services Nationwide, Funds Are Spread Among All States, In Proportion To Population Aged 5–17. Data Were Received From ED on Sept. 15, 1998.]

State	Total estimated grant under H.R. 3248 at FY1999 authorized level	ED estimates of total FY1998 grants	Percentage difference
Alabama	\$43,427,000	\$37,847,464	14.7
Alaska	10,396,000	21,791,724	-52.3
Arizona	42,557,000	39,586,425	7.5
Arkansas	26,450,000	21,687,428	22.0
California	315,580,000	298,178,752	5.8
Colorado	31,706,000	31,361,652	1.1
Connecticut	27,552,000	30,118,669	-8.5
Delaware	10,134,000	11,672,901	-13.2
District of Columbia	10,009,000	29,603,406	-66.2
Florida	126,307,000	120,603,903	4.7
Georgia	72,595,000	62,047,160	17.0
Hawaii	11,295,000	34,723,242	-67.5
Idaho	12,016,000	13,038,722	-7.8
Illinois	118,597,000	106,357,682	11.5
Indiana	48,734,000	47,454,205	2.7
Iowa	23,036,000	38,284,832	-39.8
Kansas	23,464,000	23,615,556	-0.6
Kentucky	42,372,000	37,141,163	14.1
Louisiana	59,024,000	62,317,031	-5.3
Maine	12,505,000	12,142,653	3.0
Maryland	42,122,000	43,739,157	-3.7
Massachusetts	53,801,000	59,841,778	-10.1
Michigan	109,986,000	90,721,762	21.2
Minnesota	40,119,000	36,383,455	10.3
Mississippi	37,531,000	32,293,424	16.2
Missouri	49,873,000	49,857,568	0.0
Montana	11,462,000	13,052,614	-12.2
Nebraska	14,727,000	21,557,260	-31.7
Nevada	12,648,000	12,905,989	-2.0
New Hampshire	10,987,000	13,283,611	-17.3
New Jersey	66,235,000	54,511,691	21.5
New Mexico	21,328,000	26,175,853	-18.3
New York	211,655,000	185,851,927	13.9
North Carolina	59,565,000	59,271,274	0.5
North Dakota	10,131,000	12,982,323	-22.0
Ohio	110,142,000	96,755,688	13.8
Oklahoma	32,982,000	34,898,615	-5.5
Oregon	28,316,000	28,584,893	-0.9
Pennsylvania	116,992,000	106,949,829	9.4
Rhode Island	11,349,000	16,087,033	-29.5
South Carolina	34,950,000	35,192,514	-0.7
South Dakota	10,562,000	14,255,337	-25.9
Tennessee	48,747,000	48,234,290	1.1
Texas	220,192,000	188,545,340	16.8
Utah	18,817,000	21,657,436	-13.1
Vermont	9,830,000	11,905,763	-17.4
Virginia	50,445,000	52,686,574	-4.3
Washington	47,584,000	56,993,741	-16.5
West Virginia	21,863,000	24,498,214	-10.8
Wisconsin	49,155,000	43,326,942	13.5
Wyoming	9,650,000	11,682,323	-17.4
Puerto Rico	71,099,000	51,413,604	38.3
Outlying Areas	13,700,000	12,140,665	12.8
BIA	13,700,000	9,749,076	40.5
Other		28,726,870	na
Total	2,740,000,000	2,686,289,000	2.0

Table prepared by CRS on Sept. 16, 1998.

□ 1045

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, when the gentleman gets around to putting charts in the RECORD, I will put

the CRS chart in that the CRS just recently sent us, which will disprove all of that.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) a very important member of the committee who will be receiving \$12,253,118 for her local classrooms through this legislation.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Madam Chairman, I know we will put it to good use. Absolutely. Because in this legislation and, by the way, I oppose this gutting amendment, but in this legislation, not only are we giving that local discretion to the informed people at the local level who know what their choices are and what their needs are, but we have here a vast number of really good options open to them. I think the debate thus far has distorted the meaning of the options that are there at the local level. For example, the implication has been that you cannot have more teachers in the classroom. We not only have more teachers in the classroom but they can use it to decrease teacher-pupil ratio and increase professional development for teachers. I could go on about the various things. In fact, here in the report, there are a number with specificity to the professionalism and the way it is going to improve standards, whether it is math and science or computers right in the classroom. I want to stress, as a former teacher, as a former PTA President, and as a former school board member, we at the local level know where this money should be going. That is the best way to do this.

Finally, and I do not think it has been stressed enough, the State in this legislation must comply with reporting to Congress, and those requirements to report how the funds are spent. We are not just giving them a blank check with total discretion. But they have to report back and explain exactly how, with precision, those funds were used to increase student achievement by the measurement of the State standards.

I urge defeat of this gutting amendment and support for the bill.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the legislation before us today.

It is time for the federal government to leave more decision, and send more money, to the local level.

This legislation will send 95%—that is 95%—of every dollar to the local school district. This is a \$2.68 billion bill that we are discussing. Based on last year's figures, that is over \$2.54 billion that will go directly to local school districts!

But that is just the money in the various programs. This bill also allows the schools to use their limited federal dollars to focus on the areas of most importance to that school district. They will not be tied to use funds in a program dictated by the federal government, but instead can make their own informed discretion—choices such as teachers in the classroom options, 27 uses, professional development, math and science instructions, computers, and teachers-pupil ratios.

This legislation allows the local school district to decide what program it wants to em-

phasize. This bill consolidates 31 separate federal education programs, and pools that money together to send to the local school districts.

It will be the local school district that decides whether to use that money on programs to combat illiteracy, efforts to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio, activities of comprehensive school reform, or any of a long list of allowable activities.

As a former teacher, PTA president, and school board member in my home community, I have always been active in the local school system. I believe that our schools are best prepared to meet the educational needs of our youth when decisions about our school are made by that local community.

This bill would allow the schools the option of continuing any of these 31 programs in their own school. The great benefit is that the school is not tied to any one particular program, but instead could use the funds for whichever program the school chooses to emphasize.

(b) LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.—Funds made available under this section to a local educational agency shall be used for the following classroom services and activities:

(1) Programs for the acquisition and use of instructional and educational materials, including library services and materials (including media materials), assessments, reference materials, and other curricular materials which are tied to high academic standards and which will be used to improve student achievement and which are part of an overall education reform program.

(2) Professional development for instructional staff.

(3) Programs to improve the higher order thinking skills of disadvantaged elementary and secondary school students and to prevent students from dropping out of school.

(4) Efforts to lengthen the school day or the school year.

(5) Programs to combat illiteracy in the student population.

(6) Programs to provide for the educational needs of gifted and talented children.

(7) Promising education reform projects that are tied to State student content and performance standards.

(8) Carrying out comprehensive school reform programs that are based on reliable research.

(9) Programs that are built upon partnerships between local educational agencies and institutions of higher education, educational service agencies, libraries, businesses, regional educational laboratories, or other educational entities, for the purpose of providing educational services consistent with this section.

(11) The acquisition of books, materials and equipment, payment of compensation of instructional staff, and instructional activities that are necessary for the conduct of programs in magnet schools.

(12) Programs to promote academic achievement among women and girls.

(13) Programs to provide for the educational needs of children with limited English proficiency or who are American Indian, Alaska Native, or Native Hawaiian.

(14) Activities to provide the academic support, enrichment, and motivation to enable all students to reach high State standards.

(15) Efforts to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio.

(16) Projects and programs which assure the participation in mainstream settings in arts and education programs of individuals with disabilities.

(17) Projects and programs to integrate arts education into the regular elementary and secondary school curriculum.

(18) Programs designed to educate students about the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights, and to foster civic competence and responsibility.

(19) Mathematics and science education instructional materials.

(20) Programs designed to improve the quality of student writing and learning and the teaching of writing as a learning process.

(21) Technology related to the implementation of school-based reform programs, including professional development to assist teachers and other school officials regarding how to effectively use such equipment and software.

(22) Computer software and hardware for instructional use.

(23) Developing, adapting, or expanding existing and new applications of technology.

(24) Acquiring connectivity linkages, resources, and services, including the acquisition of hardware and software, for use by teachers, students, and school library media personnel in the classroom or in school library media centers, in order to improve student learning.

(25) After-school programs designed to engage children in a constructive manner and to promote their academic, developmental, and personal growth;

(26) Developing, constructing, acquiring, maintaining, operating, and obtaining technical assistance in the use of telecommunications audio and visual facilities and equipment for use in the classroom.

(27) Developing, acquiring, and obtaining technical assistance in the use of educational and instructional video programming for use in the classroom.

We all read about the many concerns people have with schools today. This is one way to improve our schools.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Clay amendment to reduce class size. We know that the size of the class and the quality of education go hand in hand and that overcrowded classrooms are one of the biggest obstacles to improving education for our children. We now have studies to confirm what parents and teachers have known for years. The smaller the class size, the better the learning experience. Even the very Republican governor of my home State of California has made smaller class size a priority for our State. But it costs money to reduce class size. Smaller classes mean training and hiring more teachers and building more classrooms. The Clay amendment will give school districts a good start toward smaller classes. Matching Federal and local funds could be used to recruit, to train, to pay the salaries of new teachers. Unlike the Dollars to the Classroom block grant, the Clay amendment holds schools accountable for the use of these funds. It requires school districts to show how reduced class size results in increased student achievement.

I urge my colleagues, vote for the Clay amendment. Turn H.R. 3248 from a bill that takes dollars from the classroom into a bill that improves education for all of our kids.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from Georgia, I want to make sure that no one thought that I was questioning the gentleman from Indiana's figures in relationship to the figures that he had. The figures that he had is a CRS study that includes nonprofits and nonschool district. We are only talking about money to the classroom in the local school district. That is a big difference.

Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) another member of the committee who will receive \$11,536,998 more to his local classrooms.

Mr. NORWOOD. Madam Chairman, we thank the chairman and, of course, we are delighted to see that. I want to point out that this is just the facts. This is just the facts, folks. We are going to get it right this particular time. I am really for reducing class size. That is important. But I am for each school district determining if they need to reduce their class size.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3248, the Dollars to the Classroom Act. Guaranteeing that 95 percent of Federal funds for elementary and secondary schools is spent directly in the classroom and not on the bureaucracy is common sense.

A recent Department of Education study found that 15 percent of every Federal education dollar is eaten up by the Federal and State bureaucracy. I am sure they have got another study giving us another number. Everybody has got their studies. The bottom line is we want this money to go to the students and go to the classrooms where people at home can make the decision about what is best for their children. Having it eaten up by the Federal government, that should not be so.

If we are going to spend Federal dollars and, remember, that is your dollars that you send up here for education and education programs, then we should make sure that these dollars support those people who actually teach our children.

That is not the only reason why I support Dollars to the Classroom. Under this bill, the great State of Georgia will receive an additional \$26 million for education. With this legislation, each classroom in the 10th District of Georgia, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), will receive an average of 425 additional dollars. For a modest size, 20-classroom school at home, that can mean an additional \$8,500. Madam Chairman, that is real money for our teachers and principals and students. Not only will this bill spend more Federal education dollars directly in the classroom, it gives our schools greater flexibility to receive money for any of the authorized uses for the existing 31 programs block-granted under the bill. Schools can choose to put a greater amount of moneys into priorities such as school safety or school reform or teacher improvement and technology if that is what that school determines it

needs. Again, the key here is that with the Dollars to the Classroom Act, we let the schools decide what their priorities are.

I plead with my colleagues, do not let the Department of Education confuse you. We are going to increase the number of dollars in this bill. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 3248.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Madam Chairman, when Europe needed to be rebuilt after World War II, we came forward with a massive Marshall Plan, \$20 billion to start and much more afterwards. When we needed to educate our GIs coming home from World War II, we passed a massive GI Bill of Rights education program and it did the job. Now we need to retool our schools. We really need a massive investment in education. What we are doing is playing Republican Chinese checkers, trivializing the whole problem by shifting money around, abolishing the Department of Education's authority and playing games by promising more money when it is the same amount of money basically that we have always had. I think the seriousness of the situation is better reflected in the statement being prepared for the superintendents who will be convening here from some of the country's most challenged school districts on Saturday.

They have prepared a statement which reads as follows: "We believe that there is a great necessity for an immediate meaningful Federal increased investment in education. Funds for school construction, class size reduction, technology and communications services must be at the core of an expanded Federal appropriation for education. The E-rate must be preserved as a permanent vehicle to lessen telecommunications costs. Additional categories of increased Federal financial assistance are needed and welcome. However, there are no substitute programs for the priorities set forth above. The preservation of the public school as an institution requires a highly visible assault on the problems which serve as monstrous roadblocks to school reform progress. A safe physical environment conducive to study is an absolute necessity."

We cannot have reduced class size unless we have more classrooms. In my district, several schools have twice the number of students they were built for. All the schools are over capacity in my district. There are several schools that still have furnaces which burn coal so the children who sit in those classrooms are endangered by coal smoke. On and on it goes.

We need a total package starting with the President's school construction package at the heart of a Federal investment in education which is adequate to meet today's needs.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the ranking member's amendment. One of the really fundamental ways in which we can really direct dollars to the classroom which will have a meaningful, long-term benefit for our children is to establish a policy that the Federal Government is going to commit a block of money for the reduction of class size. In my State, this would be an enormous boon to the establishment of better quality education for a wide spectrum of our classrooms where children are still suffering under very, very large ratios of sometimes 30 or 32 students per classroom. We could ask the question, "Why don't you do something about the class size?" Well, basically the biggest difficulty that districts have is in the school construction area. So fundamentally, there probably should be an additional amendment which would go to school construction, because in order to lower class size, we have to find the accommodations for the classes. But basically if we are able to add 100,000 additional teachers to our school population of teachers throughout the country, this will bring an enormous benefit directly to the classroom, directly to the children. If this is the purported purpose of the majority's support of Federal educational programs, here is an opportunity to really support a direct program that will have a direct beneficial impact on the education of our children. Individualization of education through smaller class size is probably the best way in which we can improve quality education for our children. This is not simply a way in which Federal moneys pour in. It requires school districts to contribute matching funds. I am in full support of this program, this amendment, and I urge this House to adopt it.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from New York, I would merely say that there are several hundred thousand teachers presently working at other jobs because they cannot find teaching jobs where they want to teach. It would be amazing if we all of a sudden decided we ought to create 100,000 more since there is no study that indicates that there is any shortage now or will be in the near future. As I said, hundreds of thousands of teachers are now working at other jobs.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) who like the other gentleman from New York who just spoke will receive in his State an additional \$13 million going to the classrooms.

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Madam Chairman, I appreciate the intent of the sponsor of this amendment to improve education for all children across this country. However, I believe that the Dollars to the Classroom legislation is quite simply better.

In short, we believe that the State of New York and specifically the people of Staten Island and Brooklyn deserve the flexibility and the autonomy to spend their tax dollars as they see fit.

The reality as we heard is that with the Dollars to the Classroom legislation, the State of New York or the State of Hawaii or the State of Indiana can spend the money as they see fit. If they want to go out and hire more teachers, they can do so.

□ 1100

If P.S. 4 in Staten Island decides they want to start a softball team they can do so. If P.S. 36 wants to expand the size of the classrooms or limit the size of the classrooms; that is, the number of students in that classroom, they can do so under this legislation.

As my colleagues know, it is important to look at those who defend the status quo as opposed to those who really and truly want to seek ways to improve quality of education in this country. Yes, education is a national issue, but we believe it is a local responsibility, and getting the money from Washington, from Albany, down to Staten Island and Brooklyn is the right approach.

Just look at the last couple of months. Education savings accounts where we wanted to provide parents the opportunity to set money aside tax free to spend on their child's education, passed this House narrowly, passed the Senate, vetoed by the President. Opportunity Scholarships, 2,000 to the poorest children in the Washington, D.C. school system to allow them to escape the horror of the public school system in Washington, D.C., passed this House narrowly in the Senate, threatened veto by the President and all the defenders of the status quo. Once again we see it here, people who are truly concerned about giving parents and teachers and local school boards the responsibility, the flexibility, the autonomy to make the decisions best for their children, we see the defenders of the status quo.

Once again, I urge the adoption of Dollars to the Classroom.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise with harboring deep concerns about the utter absence of any accountability in H.R. 3248 which is why I am in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY). With 3248 I say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) who is my good friend that my major concern, and I would agree with him that more money is going to local school districts that make those decisions, this is the right thing to do. But here in the Congress we passed the Welfare Reform Act that made it clear that we wanted accountability from welfare recipients. I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle why would we stop or why that principle does not apply here. I have no

problem giving money to local school districts. All I would like to see is that they demonstrate to us that indeed what they are getting, the moneys they are getting from the taxpayers, is actually resulting in improvement or increased through the performance, which is why the Clay amendment is so important. It provides money to reduce class size from 26 to 18, but the money will be taken away if the school districts cannot demonstrate that the reduced class sizes has resulted and increased student performance.

3248: Gone would be technology for education, gone would be the Eisenhower Professional Development program. In the private sector we spend anywhere from 6 to 10 percent training and training and retraining workers. Why it is we do not see that it is important to spend that type of money to train and retrain teachers is beyond me. Gone would be the magnet schools programs. Gone would be charter schools. Gone would be the 21st Century Community Learning Centers. New ideas, new approaches; fresh ideas, fresh approaches.

Mr. Chairman, the Clay amendment is the right way to go for this reason: accountability, accountability, accountability. On this side of the aisle we constantly praise, and I must admit sometimes I am at odds with the Reagan legacy. But Ronald Reagan said something I think that even my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), would have to agree with: Trust but verify. That is all we are asking for on this side. If we are going to give money to these local agencies which are huge sums of money to Kentuckians, to Pennsylvania, to Alabama and to Tennessee, let us at least hold these agencies accountable for the students, for these 6-, 7-, 8-year-olds cannot vote, we can, their parents can. Let us hold them accountable and do the right thing.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge us to do the right thing and support the amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that there is 1½ pages of accountability in this legislation, very, very important accountability. They have to show how they have used the money and how it has improved their school district.

See, I wish we could get away from this business of saying that somehow or other the programs that we have had for the last 30 or 35 years worked wonders. If those programs had worked wonders, why are 40 percent of our children at the end of third grade not able to read at a third grade level? If those programs worked so well where they accounted every penny, every penny that counters came in to do, if they worked so well, why would 50 percent of our students who graduate not do well in math and science?

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from that

wonderful State of Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from the wonderful State of California for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Dollars to the Classroom Act and in support of the Clay substitute. We should be working to ensure that a free quality education is available to all elementary and secondary education students in the United States and one that is as equal as possible so that everyone has as equal a chance as everyone else. That is not the way it is today, and the fact is that the Dollars to the Classroom Act I believe would undermine public education in this country because the basis of the bill is that not enough funding is going directly to the classroom, but the independent, very respected auditors, Coopers & Lybrand, would disagree. In an independent audit of elementary and secondary education programs administered by DOE Coopers & Lybrand found that the Department spends \$87 million to administer more than \$20 billion in grants to elementary and secondary education. That is four-tenths of 1 percent. These programs include Eisenhower Professional Development Grants for teachers, Goals 2000, et cetera, et cetera, and States can determine how to spend that money as easily as they could with a block grant.

I do have concerns about the dissolution of the 31 programs consolidated into a block grant, but I am most disappointed at the lack of consideration for the school districts most in need of federal assistance who would lose title I assistance. The Federal share of funding is only a small percentage, as we know, of the overall dollars spent on public elementary and secondary education because most Federal education funding is raised at the local level through property taxes. High poverty areas are at an automatic disadvantage in funding for their public schools, and title I is their vital funding source to make up for that disparity in funding between public schools in high poverty areas and those in high income areas. Passage of this act would end this important program for those areas with the lowest tax bases. Rather than taking funding away from our public schools the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) would add additional funding to our classrooms. Under block grants, increases in the student body would be ignored despite the fact that school crowding is one of the most pressing problems. The Clay substitute would reduce class sizes, and it ought to be supported.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to make sure that people are not confused now that somehow or other title I money is going to be in this block grant. We made very, very sure other than some little tiny demonstration program, I made very sure that title I was not in,

I made very sure that individuals with disabilities education is not in because those are the two, only two, big programs that the Department has, and I made very sure that they are not part of it. Some little tiny demonstration program, yes, IDEA and title I. No, they are not part of the block grant.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, again just to address the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) before I would allow him to recognize someone because they have more time than we have. He said that yesterday in the Committee on Rules and I explained to him in the Committee on Rules he better read his own bill because in his bill there are two sections to title I that are excluded as repealed in this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP).

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak for this, speak on behalf of Dollars to the Classroom and against this amendment, because of how it works for Kentucky. Kentucky has long been cited for their education reform bill that was passed in 1990, and I was proud to have supported that bill and to have been on the partnership for the implementation of it.

The entire bill, the entire reform was based on the fact that schools know best what their talents are, what their obstacles are, what the challenges are, their unique children in that school face, and the ideal was to put the dollars in the hands of a site-based decision-making counsel made up of parents, made up of school employees, made up of teachers and the principal, and all together now they have the right to hire the teacher, hire the principals. They have the right to divide up their allocation of money. And the one thing I hear repeatedly from them is please stop telling us from Washington how we have to spend our money, how we have to comply with all these little incremental spendings instead of giving us the ability to really freely address the challenges that most confront our kids.

I want to point out that Secretary Riley points to Kentucky very often when he speaks as the model of school-based reform, the model of what all schools should be after, and it is hard to believe that a Department of Education would support a program that would fly in the face of what he points to every day as a model of school reform.

This bill is compatible with education in Kentucky with school reform. The substitute that has been proposed absolutely goes in the opposite direction of everything he talks about being good for schools. How we would possibly take a step like that when both sides agree that schools succeed one school at a time, one classroom at a time, one child at a time, and they have to be free and able to use their resources to do that.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, at this time I just want to comment on the fact they keep saying over and over again that only 6 or 7 percent of the total amount of money that is spent on elementary and secondary education in this country come from federal resources. So 93 or 94 percent of the resources come from state and local governments, but when it comes time to talk about the condition of our schools which people want to say could be much better and are not all that they should be, 94 percent of the blame gets laid at the feet of the Federal Government and 7 or 6 percent of the blame gets laid at the local and State government.

The fact of the matter is every level of government has responsibility to step forward and participate in making sure that we have the best educational system we can possibly have. People in my district in Massachusetts understand that this is a responsibility that is shared. They do not want to place the blame, they want to get moving on doing some things that are going to help the educational system.

Block granting, it is never on the charts when we ask people how they want to help improve their schools. They do not want to combine programs, do away with accountability, let States shift money from programs that are national priorities to other areas and then eventually defund. They state very clearly what they want in Massachusetts is for the Federal Government to step forward and play a role to help them modernize their schools because locally they do not have the resource, they have been unable to do that. So they have asked, because it is a national issue and a national infrastructure question, that the Federal Government step forward and provide funds, that when it comes time to making the classrooms the appropriate size, when instruction can best be done, they have not got the resources. They have looked to the Federal Government to target that particular area, and they have said give us some resources, and that is what this amendment does, and that is the way this system should function.

We have seen time and time again through examples in Tennessee, in Indiana, in North Carolina and Wisconsin smaller classroom sizes, a smaller ratio of teachers to students, has a positive effect on the ability of those students to learn, maintain their grade level throughout, and do a better job eventually and lead to a better life and a better community.

Let us stop with the politicking, let us stop with the slogans. As my colleagues know, Dollars to the Classroom is something everybody wants. It is not going to be done by defunding education through this system or anything else, it is going to be done by an effective approach.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard speakers from Kentucky, Tennessee; I see one from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, I enter into the RECORD letters which are unsolicited, expressing enthusiastic support from professional educators from Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Louisiana, Kansas and several others.

The letters referred to are as follows:

KENTUCKY ASSOCIATION OF
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS,
Lexington, KY, July 6, 1998.

Hon. JOSEPH PITTS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PITTS: On behalf of the members and board of directors of the Kentucky Association of Professional Educators (KAPE), I want to express enthusiastic support for H.R. 3248—Dollars to the Classroom Act.

It is time that: a shift in how federal education dollars can be delivered to our nation's schools; dollars go directly to the classroom while giving states and local educators more funding options; teachers' hands not be tied with heavy regulations and tightly restricted grant programs; educators have greater flexibility to receive money for any of the authorized uses of the existing 31 programs; school districts are able to choose how federal money will be put into priority initiatives such as school safety, school technology, teacher improvement, and school reform.

It is our hope that Republicans will be ready to counter the accusations that are sure to come, such as cutting education programs, gutting the U.S. Department of Education and hurting children. We hope you and the Republicans are prepared to aggressively prepare to respond with arguments outlining the real value and benefits of this act.

We encourage your continued efforts in seeing this piece of legislation passed.

Sincerely,

RUTH GREEN,
Executive Director.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS
OF TENNESSEE,
Columbia TN, July 28, 1998.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PITTS: The Board of Directors of Professional Educators of Tennessee register their support for the principles of: (1) using more of the money returned to the states from the federal government in the classroom instead of in bureaucratic offices, (2) allowing the states greater discretion in the use of dollars returned to the states by the federal government and (3) giving those closer to the child a greater voice in how education funds are spent; and finding these principles in the Dollars to the Classroom Act (H.R. 3248) by Representative Joseph Pitts of Pennsylvania and Senator Tim Hutchinson of Arkansas; we do endorse the Dollars to the Classroom Act; and encourage our Tennessee Representatives and Senators to support and vote for the Dollars to the Classroom Act.

Professional Educators of Tennessee is an organization of two thousand Tennesseans employed in education or preparing for a career in education. Sixteen percent of our members are education students in the universities of Tennessee. Of the remaining members, ninety-seven percent are teachers and administrators in the public schools of

Tennessee. Professional Educators of Tennessee has a presence in 89 public school systems in Tennessee.

Sincerely

WALTER JEWELL,
Executive Director.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS
OF IOWA,
Oskaloosa, IA, July 21, 1998.

Hon. JOSEPH PITTS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PITTS: On behalf of the members and board of directors of Professional Educators of Iowa (PEI), I am expressing our support for H.R. 3248—Dollars to the Classroom Act.

PEI was formed in 1981 by a group of educators that were concerned about the direction that the Iowa State Education Association, a subsidiary of the National Education Association, was leading teachers in Iowa with their philosophies and methods. These brave educators felt the need for a professional alternative that keeps the best interest of children first.

PEI is a nonprofit, nonpartisan; professional alternative to the labor union mentality that we believe is not good for public teachers and their students. We believe that educators should have the freedom to choose the organizations to which they want to belong. We also believe that local control of our schools is essential for the children of their respective districts. This allows parental involvement in educational programs, systems, curriculums and policies. Systemic change must occur before there can be any significant improvement in the public systems. Funding streams can be a key to positive change.

In our spring survey, one of the questions we asked our membership was if block-grant federal education dollars should be given back to the state government to spend as they see fit. The response is as follows: 50%—yes; 7%—no; 26%—need more information; 17%—no response. Another question we posed was that if block-grant funding passed, should it have provision to eliminate the Federal Department of Education within a specified time. The response is as follows: 44%—yes; 9%—no; 31%—need more information; 16%—no response.

We believe that the overwhelming majority of Professional Educators of Iowa members will support the Dollars to the Classroom Act when they have an understanding of the consolidation of other money streams and the return to local control.

The growth of Professional Educators of Iowa (over 600% since 1994) should help in your courageous battle to loosen government control, and resist the giant union lobby to do what is right and best for our children. Representative Pitts, we applaud your efforts and encourage you to persevere.

Thank you for your mission to improve America's schools.

Sincerely,

JIM HAWKINS,
State Director.

MISSOURI STATE
TEACHERS ASSOCIATION,
Columbia, MO, August 20, 1998.

Hon. JOSEPH PITTS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PITTS: The Missouri State Teachers Association (MSTA) has long been an advocate for state and local control of public education. Founded in 1856, our 41,000 members have made local control a major tenet of our platform. Your legislation, H.R. 3248, the Dollars to Classroom Act, provides for a flexible grant program to dis-

tribute current federal aid to states and their respective community schools.

The history of federal programs has been one of bureaucracy and red tape that restricts the educational community's ability to prioritize federal funds to best assist improvement in student achievement. The application of a common sense approach to assist the needs of a local community's public schools have been handcuffed by federal rules, regulations and excessive administrative oversight.

MSTA has traditionally opposed federal intervention and intrusion into state and local control of public education, especially in the area of assessment and curriculum. MSTAs adopted resolutions also state that should funding for federal programs be distributed through block grants, then the Missouri State Board of Education, through Missouri's Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, should be given the authority to distribute those funds. In addition, local school districts could also benefit from having direct access to these funds under your proposal as more money could be spent on children in the classroom, not on federal bureaucracy and the administrators that run it. School districts that want to continue with the 31 grant programs that are being consolidated still have the opportunity to continue those individual programs. That decision is an exercise in freedom of choice and allows them to redirect the funds as they choose.

A letter will be sent to the Missouri congressional delegation to indicate our support of H.R. 3248 and encouraging them to vote for its passage. Your legislation allows the "public" in public education to have a larger say in how their tax dollars are spent.

Sincerely,

KENT KING,
Executive Director.

ASSOCIATED PROFESSIONAL
EDUCATORS OF LOUISIANA,
Baton Rouge, LA, August 13, 1998.

Hon. JOSEPH PITTS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PITTS: It is with much enthusiasm that I submit the enclosed resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Associated Professional Educators of Louisiana in support of H.R. 3248, Dollars to the Classroom Act. Our enthusiasm is generated by your common sense approach to the generation of additional funding for classrooms through the reduction of senseless and burdensome paperwork and the return of financial decision-making to those closest to the educational needs of our children.

Resourceful educators leave few stones unturned in their search for additional funding, and as a result, they spend countless hours in researching, applying, and then documenting the application of grant funds. It is bad enough that so much time is required of education department personnel (at both the state and federal level) in administering these funds, but the time spent by the teacher in pursuit of these funds is robbing the classroom of preparation time that might result in greater learning.

A number of studies have been made to determine how much of our education dollars actually reach the classroom—with varied results. Time and again, it has been reported that from four to six times as much paperwork is required to administer funding from the federal level as from the local level. Because there is general agreement that no more than 84% of federal funding reaches the classroom, a tremendous financial advantage would be gained through the passage of your bill which guarantees 95% of funding would be provided for classroom activities.

The purpose of education is to impart knowledge to students not to increase payrolls and size of the staff. Every worker spending time on burdensome paperwork—much of which could be eliminated by the passage of H.R. 3248—is siphoning dollars away from the necessities of education in the classroom. Thousands of non-productive workers could be eliminated in virtually every state under the concept you are proposing.

As noted in the resolution, we support H.R. 3248 and we are encouraging the entire Louisiana Congressional Delegation to support your measure, as well. We wish you the best of luck.

Sincerely,

MARCIA KOOPMANN,
State President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, this independent organization of professional educators was founded on the premise that educators deserved an independent local voice that represented the consensus of its members and that teaching methods, styles, and direction should be compatible with the student population in schools and the goals of the school district as determined at the local level, and

Whereas, sufficient funding is one of the most critical issues confronting successful education, the shortage of which drives resourceful educators to devote much of their precious time to the preparation of grant applications to fund perceived needs not being met with regular funding sources, and

Whereas, the administrative costs at the state and federal level of processing, monitoring, and reviewing these grant programs significantly reduces funding that is provided for the true purposes under which the grant program was established and the paperwork burden greatly increases the personnel requirements, and therefore the financial requirements at the state level, thus further reducing the effective use of available funds, and

Whereas, legislation is currently pending before Congress in the form of H.R. 3248, *Dollars to the Classroom Act*, by Rep. Joseph Pitts, that would shift power and funding for local schools from Washington to the states and would guarantee that at least 95 percent of existing federal funds reach the classroom. While not preventing the continued participation in existing federal programs, this major policy change would shift decision-making to the states and would allow no more than 5 percent of this money to be used for paperwork and administration. A 'harmless' provision would guarantee that states receiving formula-based grants could not receive less than the amount they would have received to carry out those programs under existing statutes. Instead of funneling billions of tax dollars through a bloated bureaucratic system, the bill would ensure that money reaches teachers, students, and principals who make local decision that allow schools to succeed. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Associated Professional Educators of Louisiana (A+PEL) does hereby completely and enthusiastically support and urge the passage of H.R. 3248—Dollars to the Classroom Act—and we strongly encourage the Louisiana Congressional Delegation, by copy of this resolution, to provide support as well. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be distributed to:

Representative Robert Livingston, Representative William Jefferson, Representative W.J. "Billy" Tauzin, Representative James M. McCrery, Representative Richard H. Baker, and Representative John Cooksey.

Official Action taken this 13th day of August, 1998.

Witness:

DORIS F. BUTLER,
MARY HALL.

Attest:

MARCIA KOOPMANN,
POLLY BROUSSARD.ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN EDUCATORS,
Mission Viejo, CA, July 28, 1998.Hon. JOSEPH PITTS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PITTS: On behalf of the members and board of directors of the Association of American Educators (AAE), and our state affiliates (see the undersigned), I write to express enthusiastic support for H.R. 3248—Dollars to the Classroom Act.

The AAE was formed just a little over four years ago by a group of concerned educators, many of whom are nationally known and respected for their contributions to public education (including 5 national educators of the year) who were not happy with the direction that the nation's most visible and vocal teacher organizations were leading us in. We felt there was a critical need for a member organization that was more concerned about our children's right to a good education than they were with just their own benefits.

The AAE is a nonprofit, nonpartisan, professional alternative to the labor union mentality that we feel is not a good fit for public school teachers. We are educators by calling but professionals by choice. We adhere to a few basic principles and beliefs, one of which is that public education will be improved if our schools, their administration, instructional services, and curriculum are under the control of and accountable to the citizens and taxpayers of the local communities they serve. We also believe that systemic changes must occur before there can be any real improvement in our educational system—especially in terms of education funding.

In that regard, an overwhelming majority of the members of the AAE would endorse your "Dollars to the Classroom" legislation. In evidence, I offer the results of our third annual survey of members of the AAE representing classroom teachers from all 50 states. When asked if they would favor legislation that would essentially block—grant federal education dollars back to the state and local governments to spend the money as they see fit—82% favored the idea, 13% had reservations, and 5% weren't sure.

Representative Pitts, I applaud your timely and sensible legislation and hope it passes. You will undoubtedly receive opposition from the protectors of the status quo—most particularly the teachers unions. For the sake of America's children, I urge you to stay the course. There is ample evidence, even from the teacher union's own internal surveys, that the union leadership does not represent the opinions of hundreds of thousands of teachers in America. In fact, there are now over 250,000 teachers who have chosen to join nonunion professional alternatives, like the AAE, in states where independent organizations have formed across the nation. These groups are growing dramatically, proving the big unions don't represent all teachers' beliefs!

Thank you for your vision for improving America's schools.

Sincerely,

Gary Beckner, Executive Director, Association of American Educators; Polly Broussard, Executive Director, Association Professional Educators of Louisiana; Ginger Tinney, Executive Director, Association of Professional Oklahoma Educators; Doug Barnett, President, Kansas Association of American Educators; Ruth Green, President, Kentucky Association of Professional Edu-

cators; Randy Hoffman, President, Keystone (PA) Teachers Association; Jim Hawkins, Executive Director, Professional Educators of Iowa; Walter Jewell, Executive Director, Professional Educators of Tennessee.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH), the Speaker of the House.

□ 1115

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much my friend from Pennsylvania yielding me this time.

This is really a very simple, straightforward policy decision. If my colleagues think the most effective way to help education is to have 31 different Washington bureaucracies with 31 different sets of regulations, 31 different auditors, 31 different sets of red tape, reports and forms, so that school districts back home fill out forms and have to keep track that they spend this dollar only in this box and this dollar only in this box, and they actually have to spend time recording everything they are doing, writing and filing reports; if my colleagues think that Washington is the center of America's education future and that bureaucracy is the answer to learning, then you should note "no."

What this bill does is very daring.

This bill says, real learning occurs when the local teacher, the local student, the local parent, and the local school board, and the local classroom make a decision. This bill, block grants \$2,700,000,000 to the States to allow the local teacher to have a decisive impact and the local parents to have a decisive impact.

Now, today when people in Washington get up and say oh, we are really helping education, here is \$100 for education. What they do not tell us is \$65 gets to the classroom, \$35 go to the bureaucrats, and that understates what is really happening, because, of course, if one goes to any teacher in America, particularly an older teacher who taught 25 or 30 years ago, and we say to them, do you fill out more paperwork now? Are there more people in your school's front office handling paper? Are there more people at the county office handling paper? We will suddenly discover that there is a hidden additional cost. Not only does 35 cents out of every Federal education dollar end up in the bureaucracy, but it distorts the time of the teacher away from education.

I used to teach both in college and high school. Education is a missionary experience. It is reaching out with love and energy and ingraining in students the interest in learning. When we make teachers into bureaucrats, we kill the missionary spirit, we kill the emotional investment. So what this bill does is it liberates teachers, parents and students to once again focus on learning, not on reports, not on regulations, not on bureaucracy, not on red tape.

Now, it also is very practical. If we are trying to balance the budget as we

are, and we have succeeded, if we are trying to make sure we control spending in Washington, the question gets to be, so how do we get more per dollar. Well, we move, with this bill, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) for his tremendous initiative in developing and pushing this forward.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) used to be the appropriations chairman of the State of Pennsylvania's legislature. He knows at the State level what the Federal Government does in red tape and bureaucracy and that is why he was able, with such passion, to work with the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) to get this money back home.

Here is what we are doing. Without raising taxes, without increasing Federal spending, we are getting \$800 million more to local classrooms. Instead of 65 cents out of every Federal dollar getting to the classroom, this bill moves it up to 95 cents, and I think that understates the effect, because there are so many fewer reports, so many fewer audits, so much less time spent on clerical bureaucratic work.

Now, that is \$425 a classroom, in the classroom. If we go up to the average teacher and say, if you had 425 extra dollars this year, whether it was for computers, whether it was for audio-visual, whether it was for instructional material or for a field trip, and you knew that you would have the ability with the local parents, the local school board and your students to actually make the decision, not fill out a form in 31 copies, send it to Washington, wait 6 months and maybe get picked. There was a school district in Texas that spent \$35,000 for a \$1,300 grant that actually used the entire grant to pay for the buses to go and pay parking at an art museum. They lost almost \$30,000 in the transaction. That is eliminated by this bill, because this bill says, the money will be back home, the teachers and parents will have it.

So I would just say to my friends on the left who are busy propping up Washington bureaucracy, if they are comfortable going home and saying, 65 cents on the dollar is all you are worth; I needed that extra 35 cents for my bureaucratic allies. And saying, no, we do not trust you, we are going to have 31 different auditors with 31 different sets of rules on 31 different sets of records, vote "no."

Mr. Chairman, I think for most Americans, people like the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) who was a teacher, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) who was a teacher, I was a teacher, many of us who were teachers, we believe as teachers that getting that money back home to the local teacher, the local parent and the local student to make the decisions, that is the right way to strengthen education in America, and I urge a "yes" vote on final passage.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), the cochair of the Democratic Education Task Force and former chief State school officer of the State of North Carolina.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning in support of this amendment and in strong opposition to this bill. Let me tell my colleagues why. Dollars for the classroom is nothing more than a hollow sound and it is a joke, because what we are talking about is cutting the allocation to where every single district in my State would lose \$12 million of money they badly need, and every other State loses money. These are the statistics I have read and have come from the department.

I served at the State level. I know what it takes. I hear this talk about paperwork, and it is true. But the truth is, usually it is not Federal paperwork, it is either State or local. People want to point to and use that as a reason not to send money.

Let me tell my colleagues what happens with block grants. I have been out there where block grants come from. But before I was the State superintendent of schools, I chaired the Committee on Appropriations of my State for 4 years, so I know how to use block grants. We send them out, and that is the best way I know; the next time comes there is a nice fat cut and we say oh, by the way, we are going to cut you this much and it is your job to reduce the administrative cost in it. And then pretty soon if you cannot get any more, you say well, you know, the problem with this program, we do not have enough accountability or enough money, so we are just going to cut out the program.

Well, I am here to tell my colleagues, we are here at the point where children are coming out of our schools at a greater number than at any other time in our history. As a matter of fact, over the next 5 years we will have more people showing up in this country than ever in the history of America, and in my State, we will be the fifth fastest growing State in the Nation.

Do not tell me we need to cut education money. We ought to be about finding a way to put additional money in it and reduce class sizes, because statistics prove when we reduce class sizes, educational opportunities for children increase and learning improves. There is abundant data available on that. Tennessee did the first study, and in North Carolina today we are reducing class sizes in kindergarten through third grade and we are doing it with State money.

Do not tell me we cannot blend these dollars at the State level and make it available to the local level without cutting and reducing the paperwork. It can be done, it is being done. This is just another way to cut the money for the public schools, and I oppose it and I think every Member of this body ought to vote against the bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has 7 and one-quarter minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have one more speaker scheduled at this time who has not arrived yet, so I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) to proceed with his speakers.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I should preface this introduction by saying Gordon would have been proud of the former State superintendent defending the bureaucracy of the State superintendents. Gordon, of course, everybody knows who that is.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and for his work on this bill.

We have heard a number of things in this debate today. We have heard that IDEA was going to be ended. It is not. We have heard that Title I was going to end. It is not. In fact, Title I is one of the programs that already comes pretty close to the standard. I think it is well over 90 percent of the money that we appropriate federally in Title I gets to districts.

We have heard from our friend from Massachusetts a moment ago that if we ask people in his district whose fault it is that education is not producing the right result, they say, the Federal Government, even though right before that, he said that only about 6 percent of the money comes from the Federal Government.

Well, maybe this House ought to be more clear with the people we represent and explain to them that only about 6 percent of this money is Federal money, that local responsibility is paramount here, that we cannot continue to confuse Americans by letting them think the solution is going to come from somewhere where the solution is not going to come from.

Local and State decision-making on programs like classroom size, local and State decision-making on how and where we ought to add teachers is possible under this bill. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Two things. The previous speaker said that mentioned IDEA. Nobody on this side mentioned that IDEA was in this bill. We know that IDEA is not in the bill, that it is a separate bill.

Number 2, again he referred to the fact that Title I was not affected by this. Title I is affected by it. If my colleagues will read their own bill, in the section 107, repeals, as I said before, and you go to item number 5, it is section 502 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 1965, which is part of Title I, and section 1503 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act,

1965 is another part of it, so Title I is affected by this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that everybody understands that Title I is not part of this, other than a little demonstration project. We have to make sure that everybody understands that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a former coach, a former teacher, a former dean of a college.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, why is the left against this bill? Because they want big government control for education and they will fight to keep it. They will do anything to keep those 760 Federal education programs which strangle the dollars going to the classroom.

Let us take a look at the D.C. bill. We could have waived Davis-Bacon for construction and saved \$26 million, but did the left choose children and schools? No, they chose their union. We had 8 witnesses in a program, and the gentleman from North Carolina talked about block grants, all different programs, all good programs. The gentleman, when we asked which one of those that the other 7 had, they had none. The whole idea of a block grant is where parents and teachers in the community can make the decision, instead of a bureaucrat here in Washington D.C. that does not know your children. The left would fund all 8 programs, have bureaucracies here in Washington D.C. which take money away from the classroom.

Let us take a look at 100,000 teachers. Well, I do not guess my colleagues wanted the money, the surplus money for Social Security, because that is where the 100,000 teachers would pay for. The left said they want all the money for Social Security, but yet to pay for the 100,000 teachers, under the balanced budget agreement that the President signed and many of the Members signed is not there.

Mr. Chairman, \$3 billion in literacy that the President wanted. There is 14 literacy programs. What is wrong with taking 1 or 2 and not just fully funding it, but increase the funding of those that work and get rid of the building, get rid of the bureaucrats that we have to pay their paycheck and their retirement which takes away from the classroom.

That is why the left does not want this bill. They want the big bureaucracy, not for children.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise as one of the members of the minority in this body, and that is that I am a classroom teacher. I spent 7 years in the public schools in Pennsylvania, and in fact, besides being a teacher and a head teacher in an impoverished district, I also for 3

years was assistant director of a Title I program, and for 1 year served in a program funded by Title III. I understand the need to get money to classroom teachers so that they can better motivate children. I also served in my capacity as vice president of my local education association.

I rise with unequivocal support for this bill. I praise my colleague and the leader of our committee who have done an outstanding job because this bill does I think what all of us in America want to do: It puts the dollars into the hands of those people who have the most responsibility to motivate young people, and that is our teachers. It is not the bureaucrats, it is not the pencil pushers in our regional offices, it is the men and women who serve in the classroom every day. And as one of them, I rise in strong support of this legislation and urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill.

□ 1130

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, and I can explain why. It is not bureaucracy protection, it is people protection. Most of us know that a very large percentage of the students in public schools are from poor families.

There is a reason why we are against repeal of Davis-Bacon, and that is because we are trying to make sure that these children's parents do not remain in such poverty that they remain the ones at risk, they remain the people who are least educated.

All of us know that the labor unions in this country brought about the quality of salaries, brought about the middle income population of this Nation, the population that has the largest tax share of responsibility for the whole Nation.

We have to give attention to children in poverty.

There are many of us who are very skeptical of our own States and the way they handle things. We look at California to see how they are against bilingual education when they have a very large number of children that need it. That is the reason why we have some concern about block granting the dollars back.

States rights have never been so good to the minorities of this country. That is one of the reasons why we want to make sure that we maintain some quality, accountability, and consistency in programs.

We also understand that well-qualified teachers with a smaller number of students is more successful. We know that from experience. That is the reason why we support reduction of class size and support more quality educational opportunities for our teachers and better pay for our teachers so we can maintain good teachers in the classroom.

It is clear that all young children need a good education. We say that all the time. There are no jobs available without a good education and without good preparation. We simply want to make sure that, as far as we can be accountable, we can ensure that that happens in these classrooms.

It is not just a sense of trying to protect bureaucracy. It is a sense of attempting to protect people and especially poor people of this Nation who work long hours for little pay, last hired and first fired. That is what we are trying to protect. We are trying to make sure that all young people are prepared to take on the future and be ready for it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, reducing class size, boosting academic standards, modernizing schools, these are real issues that affect our communities, our children, and the people that we care about.

But instead of dealing with these challenges, instead of focusing resources where they are most needed, this bill will take American schools backwards.

Worse yet, it kills off educational programs that have proven successful all across the country, programs like the School-to-Work programs that train high school students for good jobs with good pay with a mentor, programs like the Eisenhower grant that pays for more teacher training, like the Goals 2000 programs that help schools boost their academic standards.

These educational programs made sure that Federal dollars were spent wisely and responsibly. The emphasis of this emphasis was on learning and was on results.

Under this block grant program, funding will inevitably decrease. Under this block grant program, funding is shifted out of the classroom, out of the schools that most need it.

What we need here is accountability in our schools, and this bill undermines that. It does nothing to reduce class size, to improve academic performance, modernize our schools, or provide school safety. These are the issues that we need to be focusing on.

Democrats have proposed hiring 100,000 new teachers, to reduce class size in schools all across the country. Smaller class sizes have been proven to increase discipline, boost academic performance. These are the kinds of educational programs we should be supporting, not shuffling funds around through block grants and calling it progress.

I oppose this block grant program. I must say to my colleagues this afternoon that it is not coincidental that this attack on education and the attack next week on Social Security comes at a time when some of my colleagues think that the country is distracted from the issues that they care about.

All of us who have been to our district understand how important education is, how strong and important it is to support our education and public education system.

They understand the need to preserve and strengthen Social Security, not to raid it, not to raid the trust fund or rob the trust fund for some kind of a tax program that my colleagues think is in the best interest of their constituencies at the cost of taking it away from literally millions of seniors in our country. They are watching this Congress and how we act.

If we act responsibly in this very difficult time this country faces or whether or not we are going to seek relief, invade educational opportunities that have been set up for the people of this country, whether we are going to invade the Social Security Trust Fund, whether or not we are going to deal with the question of Health Maintenance Organizations that the people of this country are crying out for some reform.

So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to oppose this block grant program. I urge my colleagues to oppose it. It is not in the best interest of education. It diminishes the things that we have built on. It takes away in an irresponsible manner, I believe, the opportunities to move forward in our public educational system.

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

Mr. Chairman, aside from the fact that the other side keeps saying that States are going to get more money, in lieu of the fact that we know that the appropriators have cut the funds to all of these programs and that they will not simply by that fact, but according to CRS, these States will lose money: Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia and Wyoming.

Mr. Chairman, if the Members who represent those States and those constituencies want to go back to their State and explain after the fact that reality sets in that they have lost money and answer to those school directors and school board members and superintendents and even the teachers and especially the students, then let them do that and let this fall on their head.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, this is just an amazing debate and a simple question that everybody has to ask themselves. The question is, do we trust the people at home, the elected school board members and the community, to try to decide what they want to spend their money on or do we in fact think that they are not very capable and so a handful of us here in Washington ought to figure out what the heck the priorities ought to be?

Now, I have to say, I think the country is coming over to our side. I do not think they want all this red tape. I do not think they want all these strings. What they want least of all is a bunch of people in the city, who do not even know what area code it is we live in, to try to tell us how to run our schools.

What the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) has proposed in this legislation is one simple thing, gather up as much of the money as you can, cut the strings, the red tape, send it back to the school districts and get the money in the classroom and let the schools decide how to spend the money.

I have to say that this concept of local control is not about local control. It is about faith and normal people who live and work in a community.

I would rather put my trust into the hands of us who live locally than to pass it off to some bureaucrats or some politicians in a far away place. Support the bill offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAPPAS).

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

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I cosponsored this bill because I think it just makes sense. In my home state of New Jersey, this means that we would receive roughly an extra 50 percent additional funding. That is \$25 million more for New Jersey, which translates into \$425 more for each classroom.

In my district, in central New Jersey, I have spoken and listened to numerous teachers, school board members and school administrators. I have heard about teachers carefully using their limited resources, yet still coming up short. They have expressed to me their frustrations in wasting limited time and funds with filling out paperwork to meet requirements of these well intended programs.

We have been blessed with wonderful teachers but it is unfair that their hands are tied from doing what they do best and what they were trained and hired to do. That is why I support Dollars to the Classroom Act. We should pass this legislation because it makes sense and will make a difference for the children of America.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, very quickly, if we go back to the early eighties, we had a whole series of categorical grant programs. We, the dictators here in Washington, said if you spend the money the way we tell you to, you can have the money. We, Republicans and Democrats, joined together. We eliminated most of those categorical grant programs. We turned it into a block grant, we gave it to the States, mandated that 80 percent of those block grant funds go on to the local school districts so that their local autonomy could say what is best. In Glens Falls, Queensbury, Clifton Park, Hyde Park, New York, they know better than we do.

This is a great bill. It is an especially good bill for New York State. I would ask the New Yorkers to come over here and vote for it. Do not go yelling for more money.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that everybody understands that those names of States that were being read have nothing to do with reality and have nothing to do with this legislation. Those States that were being read deal with, as a matter of fact, non-profits and nonschool districts. We are interested in getting the money to school districts. We are interested in getting the money down to the children.

What we are admitting is that the well-intended programs of the last 30 some years did not work. Let us admit it. Let us try something different. That is why we have 40 percent of the children at the end of third grade that do not read at third grade level. That is why we have 50 percent of our students that do not do well in math and science when they graduate.

Let me remind my colleagues, on this amendment that is being offered, they are talking about \$20 billion over a 5-year period. They did not say where it is going to come from. In all probability, it is going to come from the very programs that they have been standing up here all morning defending. It has to come from somewhere, folks. There is no tree up there that is going to yield it.

I include the following for the RECORD:

TABLE 15.—ESTIMATED STATE ALLOCATIONS SPECIFICALLY TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (LEAs) UNDER H.R. 3248 COMPARED TO ESTIMATED ALLOCATIONS TO LEAs UNDER CURRENT PROGRAMS THAT WOULD BE CONSOLIDATED UNDER H.R. 3248

State	Total estimated grants to LEAs under H.R. 3248 (at 96%)	Total estimated grants to LEAs under current programs	Percentage change
Alabama	\$32,480,640	\$28,726,394	13.1
Alaska	8,574,720	9,973,798	-14.0
Arizona	31,996,800	27,196,850	17.6

TABLE 15.—ESTIMATED STATE ALLOCATIONS SPECIFICALLY TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (LEAs) UNDER H.R. 3248 COMPARED TO ESTIMATED ALLOCATIONS TO LEAs UNDER CURRENT PROGRAMS THAT WOULD BE CONSOLIDATED UNDER H.R. 3248—Continued

State	Total estimated grants to LEAs under H.R. 3248 (at 96%)	Total estimated grants to LEAs under current programs	Percentage change
Arkansas	19,791,360	14,926,986	32.6
California	237,103,680	212,174,852	11.7
Colorado	23,698,560	18,948,065	25.1
Connecticut	20,659,200	18,744,802	10.2
Delaware	6,339,520	7,893,343	5.7
District of Columbia	6,355,840	7,431,557	12.4
Florida	94,823,040	91,729,340	3.4
Georgia	54,471,360	42,934,372	26.9
Hawaii	8,868,480	8,996,313	26.8
Idaho	9,253,440	8,516,600	8.7
Illinois	88,815,360	72,854,420	21.9
Indiana	36,406,080	30,973,512	17.5
Iowa	17,131,200	12,779,617	34.1
Kansas	17,618,880	15,544,068	13.3
Kentucky	31,801,920	24,600,251	29.3
Louisiana	44,208,960	34,665,652	27.5
Maine	9,648,000	8,159,272	18.2
Maryland	31,515,840	25,493,567	23.6
Massachusetts	40,377,600	38,492,132	4.9
Michigan	82,742,400	65,986,110	25.4
Minnesota	30,007,680	23,832,451	25.9
Mississippi	28,125,120	21,427,695	31.3
Missouri	37,344,960	29,020,065	28.7
Montana	9,038,400	7,169,578	26.1
Nebraska	11,083,200	11,733,360	-5.5
Nevada	9,667,200	8,894,488	8.7
New Hampshire	8,675,520	7,389,104	17.4
New Jersey	49,601,280	37,348,162	32.8
New Mexico	16,026,240	13,700,687	17.0
New York	159,475,200	146,444,545	8.9
North Carolina	44,436,320	40,496,357	10.0
North Dakota	8,333,760	7,915,178	5.3
Ohio	82,574,400	85,323,229	26.4
Oklahoma	24,687,360	20,223,570	22.1
Oregon	21,254,400	17,502,102	21.4
Pennsylvania	87,925,440	71,081,085	23.7
Rhode Island	9,001,920	7,181,696	25.3
South Carolina	26,136,000	23,189,775	12.7
South Dakota	8,543,040	7,702,811	10.9
Tennessee	36,509,760	29,345,406	24.4
Texas	165,546,240	134,012,463	23.5
Utah	14,062,080	11,304,868	24.4
Vermont	8,186,880	7,350,078	11.4
Virginia	37,687,680	30,384,386	24.0
Washington	35,669,760	34,440,440	3.6
West Virginia	16,408,320	13,455,322	21.9
Wisconsin	36,780,480	27,695,883	32.8
Wyoming	8,081,280	6,853,872	17.9
Puerto Rico	53,332,800	40,548,467	31.5

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I strongly support this amendment because it seeks to alleviate a real problem that affects our Nation's schools by reducing class sizes in grades 1st through 3rd. It is clear that the "Dollars to the Classroom Act" cannot provide the necessary support for our education system. Without this amendment, H.R. 3248 is simply a politically-motivated measure that simply ignores the actual needs of the schools.

This amendment would reduce the class size in grades 1st through 3rd to an average of 18 students per class. The measure implements this program by authorizing \$1.1 billion in FY 1999 and \$7.34 billion over a five year period.

More importantly, this amendment would alleviate the concerns surrounding overburdened teachers by enabling schools to hire over 100,000 by the year 2005.

Funding proposed by this amendment would allow schools to recruit, train, and pay these additional teachers. Moreover, the funds would ensure that the teachers are equipped with the most current and effective instructional techniques.

The amendment also requires the school districts to demonstrate how reduced class sizes are resulting in increased student achievement.

I firmly believe that this amendment will serve the educational community well. Unlike H.R. 3248, this amendment serves the needs of our schools.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 543, further proceedings on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 543, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 1 offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 2 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 207, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

AYES—200

Abercrombie	Clayton	Evans
Ackerman	Clement	Farr
Allen	Clyburn	Fattah
Andrews	Condit	Fazio
Baesler	Conyers	Filner
Baldacci	Costello	Ford
Barcia	Coyne	Fox
Barrett (WI)	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Becerra	Cummings	Frost
Bentsen	Danner	Furse
Berman	Davis (FL)	Gejdenson
Berry	Davis (IL)	Gephardt
Bishop	Davis (VA)	Goode
Blumenauer	DeGette	Gordon
Bonior	Delahunt	Green
Borski	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Boswell	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Boucher	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Boyd	Dingell	Hamilton
Brady (PA)	Dixon	Harman
Brown (CA)	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Hefner
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Hinchey
Cannon	Edwards	Hinojosa
Capps	Engel	Holden
Cardin	Eshoo	Hooley
Carson	Etheridge	Hoyer

Jackson (IL)	Meeks (NY)	Scott
Jackson-Lee	Menendez	Serrano
(TX)	Miller-	Sherman
Jefferson	McDonald	Sisisky
John	Minge	Skaggs
Johnson (WI)	Mink	Skelton
Johnson, E. B.	Moakley	Slaughter
Kanjorski	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy (MA)	Moran (VA)	Smith, Adam
Kennedy (RI)	Morella	Snyder
Kildee	Murtha	Spratt
Kilpatrick	Nadler	Stabenow
Kind (WI)	Neal	Stark
Klecza	Oberstar	Stenholm
Klink	Obey	Strickland
Kucinich	Olver	Stupak
LaFalce	Ortiz	Tanner
Lampson	Owens	Tauscher
Lantos	Pallone	Taylor (MS)
Lee	Pascrell	Thompson
Levin	Pastor	Thurman
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Tierney
Lipinski	Pelosi	Towns
Lofgren	Peterson (MN)	Trafigant
Lowe	Pickett	Turner
Luther	Pomeroy	Velazquez
Maloney (CT)	Price (NC)	Vento
Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Visclosky
Markey	Ramstad	Waters
Martinez	Rangel	Watt (NC)
Mascara	Reyes	Waxman
Matsui	Rivers	Wexler
McCarthy (MO)	Rodriguez	Weygand
McCarthy (NY)	Roemer	Whitfield
McDermott	Rothman	Wise
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey
McHale	Rush	Wynn
McIntyre	Sabo	Yates
McKinney	Sanders	Young (AK)
McNulty	Sandlin	
Meehan	Sawyer	

NOES—207

Aderholt	Emerson	Largent
Archer	English	Latham
Armey	Ensign	LaTourette
Bachus	Everett	Lazio
Baker	Ewing	Leach
Ballenger	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Barr	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Barrett (NE)	Fossella	Linder
Bartlett	Fowler	Livingston
Barton	Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo
Bass	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bateman	Gallegly	Manzullo
Bereuter	Ganske	McCrery
Bilbray	Gekas	McHugh
Bilirakis	Gibbons	McInnis
Bliley	Gilchrest	McIntosh
Blunt	Gillmor	McKeon
Boehkert	Gilman	Metcalfe
Boehner	Gingrich	Miller (FL)
Bonilla	Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Bono	Goodling	Myrick
Brady (TX)	Graham	Nethercutt
Bryant	Granger	Neumann
Bunning	Greenwood	Ney
Burr	Gutknecht	Northup
Buyer	Hansen	Norwood
Callahan	Hastert	Nussle
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	Oxley
Camp	Hayworth	Packard
Campbell	Hefley	Pappas
Canady	Herger	Paul
Castle	Hill	Paxon
Chabot	Hilleary	Peterson (PA)
Chambliss	Hobson	Petri
Chenoweth	Hoekstra	Pickering
Christensen	Horn	Pitts
Coble	Hostettler	Pombo
Coburn	Houghton	Porter
Collins	Hulshof	Portman
Combest	Hunter	Quinn
Cook	Hyde	Radanovich
Cooksey	Inglis	Redmond
Crane	Istook	Regula
Crapo	Jenkins	Riley
Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Rogan
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Deal	Jones	Rohrabacher
DeLay	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Roukema
Dickey	Kim	Royce
Doolittle	King (NY)	Ryun
Dreier	Kingston	Salmon
Duncan	Klug	Sanford
Dunn	Knollenberg	Saxton
Ehlers	Kolbe	Scarborough
Ehrlich	LaHood	Schaefer, Dan

Schaffer, Bob	Snowbarger	Tiahrt
Sensenbrenner	Solomon	Upton
Sessions	Souder	Walsh
Shadegg	Spence	Wamp
Shaw	Stearns	Watkins
Shays	Stump	Weldon (FL)
Shimkus	Sununu	Weldon (PA)
Shuster	Talent	Weller
Skeen	Tauzin	White
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Smith (OR)	Thomas	Wilson
Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Wolf
Smith, Linda	Thune	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—28

Blagojevich	Kaptur	Poshard
Burton	Kennelly	Pryce (OH)
Clay	Manton	Riggs
Cox	McCollum	Sanchez
DeFazio	McDade	Schumer
Fawell	Meek (FL)	Stokes
Gonzalez	Mica	Torres
Goss	Miller (CA)	Watts (OK)
Hilliard	Parker	
Hutchinson	Pease	

□ 1205

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Manton for, with Mr. Mica against.

Messrs. BATEMAN, GALLEGLY, CHABOT, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. LOFGREN, and Messrs. SCOTT, WHITFIELD, SHERMAN, FOX of Pennsylvania, and OBERSTAR changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MARTINEZ

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 215, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No 451]

AYES—190

Abercrombie	Boucher	Davis (FL)
Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)
Allen	Brown (CA)	DeGette
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Delahunt
Baesler	Brown (OH)	DeLauro
Baldacci	Capps	Deutsch
Barcia	Cardin	Dicks
Barrett (WI)	Carson	Dingell
Bentsen	Clayton	Dixon
Berman	Clement	Doggett
Berry	Clyburn	Dooley
Bishop	Costello	Doyle
Blumenauer	Coyne	Edwards
Bonior	Cramer	Engel
Borski	Cummings	Eshoo
Boswell	Danner	Etheridge

Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin

Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)

Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabro
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—215

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billray
Billarakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)

Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton

Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Paul
Paxon
Peterson (PA)

Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough

Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu

Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Becerra
Blagojevich
Burton
Clay
Condit
Conyers
Cox
DeFazio
Fawell
Gonzalez

Goss
Hoyer
Hunter
Kapur
Kennelly
Manton
McDade
Meek (FL)
Mica
Miller (CA)

Parker
Pease
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Riggs
Sanchez
Schumer
Stokes
Torres

□ 1213

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Kennelly of Connecticut for, with Mr. Mica against.

Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3248) to provide dollars to the classroom, pursuant to House Resolution 543, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 198, answered “present” 1, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

AYES—212

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Billarakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske

Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley

Packard
Pappas
Paxon
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Radanovich
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOES—198

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)

Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boehlert

Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)

Capps	John	Pascarell
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Carson	Johnson (WI)	Payne
Clayton	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Clement	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Clyburn	Kelly	Pickett
Condit	Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Costello	Kildee	Quinn
Coyne	Kilpatrick	Rahall
Cramer	Kind (WI)	Ramstad
Cummings	Kleczka	Rangel
Danner	Klink	Reyes
Davis (FL)	Kucinich	Rivers
Davis (IL)	LaFalce	Rodriguez
DeGette	Lampson	Roemer
Delahunt	Lantos	Rothman
DeLauro	Leach	Roybal-Allard
Deutsch	Lee	Rush
Dicks	Levin	Sabo
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Dixon	Lipinski	Sandlin
Doggett	Lofgren	Sawyer
Dooley	Lowey	Scott
Doyle	Luther	Serrano
Edwards	Maloney (CT)	Sherman
Engel	Maloney (NY)	Sisisky
Eshoo	Markey	Skaggs
Etheridge	Martinez	Skelton
Evans	Mascara	Slaughter
Farr	Matsui	Snyder
Fattah	McCarthy (MO)	Spratt
Fazio	McCarthy (NY)	Stabenow
Filner	McDermott	Stark
Ford	McGovern	Stenholm
Frank (MA)	McHale	Strickland
Frost	McKinney	Stupak
Furse	McNulty	Tanner
Gedjenson	Meehan	Tauscher
Gephardt	Meeks (NY)	Thompson
Gilman	Menendez	Thurman
Gordon	Millender	Tierney
Green	McDonald	Towns
Gutierrez	Minge	Traficant
Hall (OH)	Mink	Turner
Hamilton	Moakley	Velazquez
Harman	Mollohan	Vento
Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Hefner	Morella	Waters
Hilliard	Murtha	Watt (NC)
Hinchey	Nadler	Waxman
Hinojosa	Neal	Wexler
Holden	Ney	Weygand
Hooley	Oberstar	Wise
Hoyer	Obey	Woolsey
Jackson (IL)	Olver	Wynn
Jackson-Lee	Ortiz	Yates
(TX)	Owens	Young (AK)
Jefferson	Pallone	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—24

Blagojevich	Kaptur	Pease
Brown (CA)	Kennelly	Poshard
Burton	Manton	Pryce (OH)
Clay	McDade	Riggs
DeFazio	Meek (FL)	Sanchez
Fawell	Mica	Schumer
Gonzalez	Miller (CA)	Stokes
Goss	Parker	Torres

□ 1233

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Mica for, with Mrs. Kennelly of Connecticut against.

Mrs. KELLY changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on September 18, 1998.

Had I been able to vote, I would have voted in the following manner.

On agreeing to the amendment of Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Roll No. 450, I would have voted no.

On agreeing to the amendment of Mr. MARTINEZ of California, Roll No. 451, I would have voted no.

On approving the final passage of H.R. 3248, To Provide Dollars to the Classroom, Roll No. 452, I would have voted yes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3248, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3248, DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3248, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce we have concluded legislative business for this week.

The House will meet next week at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, September 22, for a pro forma session. There will not be votes that day.

Wednesday, September 23, the House will meet at 2 p.m. for legislative business. However, we do not expect any recorded votes before 5 p.m. on Wednesday. Of course, this is because of the Jewish holidays. On Wednesday, September 23, we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices this afternoon.

On Thursday, September 15 and throughout the balance of the week, the House will consider the following legislation:

H.R. 4006, the Lethal Drug Abuse Prevention Act; H.R. 3736, the Workforce Improvement and Protection Act of 1998; H.R. 2621, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act, Fast Track; H.R. 4579, the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1998; and, finally, H.R. 4578, the Save Social Security Act.

Mr. Speaker, we also hope to consider conference reports on the Department of Defense authorization, a very important bill; the higher education bill, and

a number of appropriation conference reports.

Mr. Speaker, Members should be prepared to work late next week on all of these appropriation bills. As the majority leader alerted Members in a Dear Colleague just yesterday, it may also be necessary to work on Saturday, September 26 to complete work on those important appropriation bills as we are nearing the end of the Federal fiscal year.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have several questions of the gentleman from New York. What day are you anticipating the fast track legislation coming to the floor?

Mr. SOLOMON. The schedule needs to be worked out, but more than likely it will be Friday. It all depends on all of the conference reports that we are getting back. But I think you can pretty much count on Friday.

Mr. BONIOR. The House has already completed its work on the continuing resolution that really has addressed the failure of this body to deal with the whole question of getting our work done on time. Now that we have passed that CR this week, why are we meeting on Saturday? The gentleman alluded to appropriation bills. Is the gentleman from New York saying that, if we meet on Saturday, it will be on appropriation bills, or are we thinking of other pieces of legislation to work on Saturday?

Mr. SOLOMON. As the gentleman knows, there have been some distractions, and we really need to keep the Members here. We are getting near the end of the year. None of us want to be faced with this problem of a shutdown as we perhaps were in the past. Personally I would say we may not be here, but I think Members better be prepared to be here on Saturday in case we need to get the work done.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me ask the question in another way, then. There was a concern that the majority may try to bring up fast track or the Tax/Social Security issue on Saturday. Can I have an assurance from my friend from New York that that will not happen?

Mr. SOLOMON. I say to the minority leader who has been in the majority, he knows how the schedule goes, and there is that possibility. Again, I think we will probably be able to stick to the schedule as was outlined by the majority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Just so I am clear here, the gentleman from New York is saying that if we do meet on Saturday, and that is only a possibility, we will be doing appropriations bills?

Mr. SOLOMON. And we may do other business, too. It is all in an effort to get the work done. We certainly do not want to be here any longer in an election year than we have to be. But I think the gentleman is probably going