

that figure, that is too high for me to run on in the next election, so we will take an amount of money out of the right pocket, put it into the left pocket, we will take \$636 billion from Social Security in this budget that we have under consideration, and put it in the general fund to make it appear we are balancing the budget. You will have to pay back Social Security with interest and at the end of the 7-year budget period, you will owe. At the end of the 7-year period, we will all have to pay back supposedly over \$1 trillion into the Social Security trust fund, and no one has any idea, not any Senator or House Member, who is going to introduce the increase in taxes to refund the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Speaker would come here and answer that question.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, it came as quite a surprise to me yesterday in researching the Republican budget plan that was much touted on the floor of this House as being the balanced budget plan of 1995, said repeatedly, that the annual operating deficit for this Nation will actually increase by \$33 billion in fiscal year 1996 over this year. I think people need to know that. The budget deficit will increase from \$263 billion on an annual operating basis to \$296 billion on an annual operating basis.

Part of this, Mr. Speaker, will come from the trust funds that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] just mentioned: The \$118 billion that people paid into things like the Social Security trust fund will be used to disguise the true nature of this debt.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is for a balanced budget. I am for a balanced budget. Let us be honest with the American people. Let us not tell them we can spend more in spending, we can receive less in taxes, that we are already \$5 trillion in debt, paying \$1 million in interest payments every 2 minutes, 2 minutes, and somehow all of this is magically going to work without pain.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is my friend, but let us be honest with this. Let us be honest with the American people. This morning you told me you were willing to borrow \$75 billion so you could give people a minuscule tax break. They have to pay that back. That is not a gift. That is just loan sharking. You are taking money from them, you are giving them a little bit back, and they are going to have to pay back a whole heck of a lot more of the time they pay the interest. Let us be honest with the American people.

The second thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, is I have had a number of calls from home. I want to assure the people of south Mississippi that I was one of the first members of this body to be against putting American troops on the ground when President Bush asked me to do it, and I will remain opposed to that when President Clinton asks me to do it.

I traveled to that part of the world a few weeks ago, traveled up to the bor-

der posts in Macedonia, had the privilege with having lunch with some fellow Mississippians, a young man from Tupelo in particular, and from four-star officers to sergeant majors. Every one of them privately told me we should not get involved there. That is not our fight.

These people have been fighting each other for 700 years. The only peace they have known recently was the 45 or so years when Tito was in charge there, using the iron fist of communism, and he got the Bosnians to quit killing Muslims and the Muslims to quit killing Serbs and the Croatians to quit killing the others. As soon as the iron fist of communism was gone, they went back to killing each other.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying that they told me that the smart weapons that worked so well in Desert Storm will not work in the cold, wet fog of Bosnia. We are going to send those kids on the ground, a bunch of them are going to die, and nothing good will come of it.

COMMON SENSE AND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think a good way to start is to echo what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] just said. I agree with his analysis of Bosnia, and I hope that we can bring some common sense to bear on that issue.

Let us talk about the budget and see if we can get some common sense and a level of agreement on what we are trying to do up here in Congress. A lot of people have said they want to balance the budget. I hope they are sincere. My gut instinct is that some mean it and some do not. The best way to judge whether a person means what they say is to look at what they do.

When I was a prosecutor in the Air Force and a defense attorney, I had this as my guide. I never quite believed everything my client told me as a defense attorney, and when the accused said he did not do it, I did not stop the investigation there. I looked behind what people say, and you judge their actions by their deeds.

So when somebody comes up here and tells you they want to balance the budget, the first question you need to ask them is are they willing to spend within the revenues generated, because if you want to spend more than you take in, you are not going to balance the budget. Does anybody have any idea how much the Federal Government has grown since 1969? I do not have that answer right now, but I have been told it has been several hundred percent. I am trying to find out how much the Federal Government has grown since we last balanced our Federal budget. I think the number is going to be shocking.

We have some folks visiting here today, and those that are listening at

home, what is your estimate that the Federal Government spends per person to run the Federal Government, on Federal Government programs? How much do you think we spend per person to operate the Federal government? Let me tell you what it was for the last 7 years. Over a 7-year period, we spent \$145,962 on a family of four. We spent \$9.5 trillion over the last 7 years to run the Federal Government.

We have come up with a new budget that balances, that has been certified to balance. Guess how much we spend as Republicans, the mean old Republicans who want to devastate everything? Guess how much money we have spent? Twelve trillion dollars. Where does that \$12 trillion come from? It comes from you, the taxpayer; it comes from you, the senior citizen. It is hard to make the money, it is far too easy to spend the money up here, but over the next 7 years we are going to take \$12 trillion of your money and run this Federal Government.

I ask one simple thing of my colleagues: Let that be enough. Twelve trillion dollars is enough to spend in Washington, DC. We can argue about how to spend it, we can rearrange the \$12 trillion pie, we can move money around, but for the sake of future generations, for the sake of fiscal sanity, please do not spend more than \$12 trillion of hard-earned taxpayer money.

Do you know what that equates to, for a family of four over a 7-year period? It is \$184,373 that will be spent by your Federal Government on a family of four. It is hard to make that much money and it is far too easy to spend it. If you do not like the tax cuts, fine. If you think we have spent too much money on defense, fine. If you think we have not spent enough money on Medicare, fine. Just agree with me and every other American who knows the facts. Rearrange the \$12 trillion pie, and do not go into our pockets any deeper. We do not have much of a picket left as it is. This is not a shoestring budget. Twelve trillion dollars is unimaginable. They tell me that if you spend \$1 million a day from the time of Christ to the present, you would not have spent \$1 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the people who are listening here, Members of Congress, to agree on one simple fact: That we can run an efficient nation on \$12 trillion, we can satisfy legitimate needs on \$12 trillion, and that any politician who wants to spend more than \$12 trillion has a problem. They do not need to be up here.

THE IMPACT OF THE CUTS IN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from South

Carolina, when he talks about \$12 trillion. That is what, for the next hours, the members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities will talk about. I wish we had \$12 trillion to spend on education, but we do not. That is why our committee members are joining today in this special order to highlight the spending cuts that will happen.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about \$12 trillion over the next whatever number of years it is, but I know the impact the education cuts are having on my own district from the rescission bill, and the potential for the budget that we will ultimately end up passing, and the lost opportunity we will have, not just for the students who are there this year or next year, but for the next generation that we hope will be the ones who are taking our place here on this floor and taking our place all over the country in the medical schools and in the professions.

□ 1445

In the name of deficit reduction, the Congress is cutting the Federal money available for education programs, and I believe we need to balance our budget. However, I do not believe that we must balance it on the backs of those children.

The purpose of the deficit reduction is to make America stronger, and we agree with that on a philosophical basis. How can we make America stronger if we are not willing to invest in education? Education is talking about the strength of America, again, not for this year, Mr. Speaker, but for the next 5 and 10 years, and even after that. We should not stand by while the Republican majority destroys the educational system that we have all worked hard to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I know in Houston we have made a solid investment in education and have a lot of individual students who are being successful, part of it because of the Federal funding that goes to the schools in our own district. A good example is Franklin Elementary School in my district, which was recognized by the U.S. Department of Education for its educational improvement.

The students at Franklin made exemplary progress in the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills last year. In 1994, only 35 percent to 59 percent of the student body passed the TAAS test as we call it, Texas Assessment for Academic Skills. In 1995, due to innovative teacher methods and a significant Federal investment in Franklin and the freedom that we had last year under title I, that school was classified as a recognized school where 75 percent of those children, at least up to 80 percent, are passing their TAAS testing. So we have a three-quarter success rate in an inner-city school that is eligible and receives both bilingual funding from the State, but also title I.

The students at Franklin are especially hurt by the cuts in title I from

the rescission bill this year. Currently, Franklin receives about \$200,000 in Federal title I funding. If the House-passed Labor-HHS appropriations bill becomes law, Franklin will lose 17 percent or \$34,000 of those funds.

Harris County in the State of Texas receives \$81.1 million in title I funds now. Under the House-passed bill originally, Labor-HHS, Harris County would lose \$13.8 million, and under the President's budget proposal, Harris County will receive \$8 million more. So what we are seeing is a loss, if we add those together of the cuts, plus the potential of \$21 million, \$21.9 million in loss of Federal funding.

We are having great success in our district. I have visited almost every elementary school in my district. I still have a few left that I go into, and I read, like a lot of Members of Congress do, and I see the success every day. I have an inner-city district that people say, oh, how can you have education success there? We have it every day, and it is because of the dedicated teachers and parents and administrators and people involved in the community.

Mr. Speaker, do not take that success away in the name of tax cuts, and that is what I am pleading. I think today the members of the committee will join in that.

Other educational programs hit hardest are the basic math and reading programs, efforts to promote safe and drug-free schools, and resources for State and local officials to implement higher standards in educational technology. Cuts in these vital programs will cause irreparable harm to students in our local community and as well around the country.

We will be spending \$4.5 billion less in 1996, almost a 20 percent of the total Federal aid cut in 1996 than we did in 1995. At the same time, local and State-wide and Nationwide enrollment trends are up. Again, using my own district as an example, our enrollment is up in the Houston Independent School District and in the Aldine School District and the Galena Park School District. We are not seeing declining enrollment. Yet we are saying, okay, you have more students, but we are giving you less money.

The Republican budget eliminates also the Goals 2000 funding, severely undermining State and local efforts to reform elementary and secondary education. In the State of Texas alone, we would lose \$29.2 million in the Goals 2000, and we have already completed our planning and begun implementation of comprehensive reforms, as provided by Goals 2000.

The Republican budget cuts Federal support for drug-free schools and community programs to the tune of \$266 million, or about 60 percent, sharply reducing drug abuse and violence prevention activities serving students in 97 percent of our Nation's schools. In Texas, we would lose \$18.9 million.

The House would cut funds to States ready to implement school-to-work

programs by \$20.6 million, or by 18 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I intend to as we proceed during this hour, but I would like to yield time to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], my colleague.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have come to the floor today to join my colleagues in addressing the serious issues of the Republican budget and the draconian cuts to education. The American public understands the importance of education. They understand now more than ever that we have to prepare the best educated young people for the challenges ahead. They want overwhelmingly to invest more resources, both Federal resources, local resources, in good, solid education for their youngsters and for the whole community.

Unfortunately, this budget takes exactly the opposite track. It disinvests in good, solid, well-established, innovative education programs.

Last Congress, we tried to move forward with an agenda of education reform and support that would truly represent a sound investment in the future of this country, particularly at a time when the old industrial age is yielding to the new information age.

Years ago, 20 years ago, 30 years ago, it would not be unreasonable for a young person to think that with a high school education he or she could leave that high school, find an adequate job, make a living to support a family, and, in fact, spend a whole career with those skills learned in high school. Today, every American understands that this is not the case, that today, in order to be an effective worker in almost every level of endeavor, you have to have postsecondary skills, either college or some technical training. The thrust and the consequence of this Republican budget is that those opportunities for higher education will be diminished.

We also understand, and the American people understand, that we have to have a solid basis in order to start our young people off on a solid path to educational achievement. That is why last year we spent a great deal of time on a bipartisan basis in developing the Goals 2000 program. Goals 2000 is an attempt, I think a very worthy attempt, to act as a catalyst from the Federal level for school reform at the local level, to provide the kind of resources, the directions and the standards that would be very necessary to move our elementary and secondary education system forward.

We also in the last Congress understood that in too many schools the education process is sacrificed to a climate of violence and intimidation, a climate that is too often indicated by pervasive drug use, and, as a result, we passed a Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act.

These legislative measures at the elementary and secondary level were important steps forward, but sadly, too,

because of this budget, those initiatives will not receive the resources that are necessary to carry on that important work.

At the level of higher education, understanding, as the American people understand, the need for advanced skills, we sought to strengthen those existing programs, like the Pell grant and the Stafford loan program to make access to higher education something that would be available and affordable for all of our citizens. It makes sense, particularly as we move from this industrial age to the new information age which demands higher skills for everyone in our society.

Again, sadly, the thrust of this Republican budget is to undercut significantly the resources that will be available for higher education. This budget would cut student loan programs by more than \$5 billion going forward for those young people that want to go on to higher education, postsecondary education.

This is going to be a tremendous burden on their lives and the lives of their families, because one of the persistent complaints, one of the persistent concerns that I hear from my constituents in Rhode Island, those working people which we all claim to represent, those working families, is that they have one or two youngsters in college and the cost of college is outrageous, and without adequate Federal assistance, they cannot send their children to the schools they want.

In some cases, they cannot send them to school at all or, in other cases, they have to make the very difficult choice of which child will be favored with a college education and which will be told, well, you have to fend for yourself in the job market without that education. That is a very, very cruel choice which I thought that we had basically prevented in the last 30 years by providing a strong Federal commitment to higher education. But, sadly, we seem to be going back to a point in time when those cruel choices were all too common.

All of this impacts mightily in the localities, the districts and the States that we represent. In my State alone, in Rhode Island, we estimate that next year we will lose about \$14 million in resources for education, and that over the next several years, the next 7 years of this budget, we will lose more than \$90 million.

Where will these cuts go to? First, I mentioned the Goals 2000 program. This is really the only money for reform and restructuring of our educational system that is available in my home State. It has been eagerly embraced by the commissioner of elementary and secondary education in my State, by all of the districts.

There is an active process, an exciting process of change that is being sponsored by this program; and, sadly, we will lose about \$1.4 million roughly all of the money that has been committed. This will affect as many as 71

schools who are participating directly as schools in the program. This is going to set back reform which is necessary and which every American citizen recognizes is necessary. It will set it back perhaps fatally.

In terms of student loans, the budget cuts would raise the cost of a college education by more than \$2,000 for over 36,000 college students and more than \$9,400 for over 5,000 graduate students in Rhode Island.

Pell grants. Changes in the Pell grant program will reduce support to students in Rhode Island by nearly \$2 million. An estimated 1,600 students in 1996 alone will be denied Pell grants as a result of this cut.

Title I program, another program very important to elementary and secondary education that provides compensatory education for low-income American. Under this budget, the funds would be cut by a total of about \$3.5 million, and this has a real impact, not only again in the lives of these students but in the tax rolls in local communities. Because as the city of Providence and the city of Central Falls and the city of Pawtucket copes with these cuts, they have to turn, once again, to their very, very strained tax rolls to make up the difference, if they can make it up at all.

So this is not just a problem for the beneficiaries of the program. It is a problem for the fiscal health of our cities and towns in Rhode Island.

I mentioned before the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act which so important last Congress, which directed resources to a problem that is gnawing at the heart not only of our educational system but of our society as a whole. That, too, is going to lose funds. These budget cuts result in about a \$1 million loss in these funds, which are helping to keep programs going, to show young people that drugs are not anything but the path to destruction and that we have to choose another path.

I would also mention one other program which touches upon the issue of education and opportunities so importantly, and that is the national service program. Americorps in Rhode Island is a shining example of a program that is inspired perhaps by legislation but embraced by the business community and the local community as a whole. The director of Americorps in our State, Larry Fish, is the chairman of one of our largest financial institutions. We are very lucky to have every category of Americorps activity funded in Rhode Island.

We have a City-Year program, which young people are spending a year helping out all through the community. We have programs that are helping through the Children's Crusade to mentor young people in schools to help them get through school and get on into college. A wonderful program, but, once again, even though this is supported strongly with corporate contributions and corporate leadership in Rhode Island, this program, too, is

being affected mightily, basically almost zeroed out, if not entirely. It would deny 450,000 young people in Rhode Island the chance to serve.

This program is so useful, too, because it embodies in my view the ethic that we should all have as Americans: serving our country, and by that serving getting a chance to go to school and educate yourself so that you can be better prepared as a citizen, as a worker, as an American. Sadly, again this program is being jeopardized by this budget.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, when we look at this budget and we look at the reality of the world, something is sadly wrong. At a time when we have to invest in education, at a time when our economic future is at stake and education will be the key to our success as an economy, as a society, as a world power, and as a source of opportunity for all of our citizens, we are turning our back on funding education.

This is a sad mistake which I hope we can rectify in the days ahead.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague from Rhode Island with whom I enjoy serving on our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I will just sum up what he said and what the concern a lot of us have is that balancing the budget requires tough choices, but we should not let the majority balance the budget on education.

The proposed budget cuts make only a tiny part in the size of the deficit. Yet they have a tremendous devastating impact on the future of America's children.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY]. We serve together on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and we actually sit together and have gotten to know each other over the last 3 years serving on that committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I compliment the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, and the members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities for organizing this special order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that it was just last year when I convinced this body to approve a landmark resolution, which put us on our way to making our schools the best in the world.

Yes, it is true.

Last year, the House approved my resolution which called on Congress to increase our investment in education by 1 percent a year, until the education budget accounts for 10 percent of the budget in 2002.

At the time, I said that the resolution would send a clear message to those who decide how our Federal dollars are spent. The appropriators received the message that this Congress was serious about improving education.

Well, guess what, folks? Times have changed. We have got a new majority

in Congress. And, instead of going forward, we are going backward. Fast.

The new majority in the House blatantly ignored the pledge we made last year to improve our children's education, and has passed some of the most antieducation legislation this Nation has ever seen.

Just take a look at the education budget for 1996 which the House has approved.

This terrible bill cuts: Head Start, chapter one, safe and drug-free schools, school-to-work, and vocational and adult education.

In all, it cuts education by 13 percent in 1 year alone; 13 percent.

But that is nothing compared to what they want to do to our education system over the next 7 years.

The new majority's 7-year budget plan would deny Head Start to 180,000 children by 2002.

It eliminates Goals 2000, which helps schools meet higher national standards and increases parental involvement.

It kills AmeriCorps, which has provided thousands of Americans with college tuition assistance in exchange for community service.

And, it cuts in half, the President's program aimed at helping schools bring technology into the classroom.

Under their budget, my State of California alone will lose, among other things, \$1 billion for the School Lunch Program, and over 181,000 Californians will be denied participation in the cost-effective direct Student Loan Program.

My friends, that is the wrong direction, and that is not the way we are supposed to be taking care of our children and their education.

You see, I believe, as do my colleagues here today, that our Nation's greatest responsibility is to provide a quality education for everybody in this country.

We believe this because education is absolutely central to solving the problems facing our Nation.

When we strengthen education, we prepare our children and workers for jobs that pay a livable wage; we get people off welfare and prevent people from having to go on welfare in the first place; we actually prevent crime and violence in our communities; and, we increase respect for our health, respect for our environment, and respect for each other.

That is why, for the life of me, I cannot understand why the new majority is cutting and gutting our education system.

You see, we can balance the budget, but it does not have to be on the backs of our children and their education.

It is time to stop this assault of education.

It is time to pass a budget that invests in education, and reduces the deficit by cutting wasteful military and Government spending; closing tax loopholes; and ending corporate welfare.

It is time to make our Nation's No. 1 special interest our children, and not the fat cats and lobbyists in Washington.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). The gentlewoman is recognized for 39 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the time being yielded to me and I appreciate the ranking member of our Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities taking the time to schedule this special order.

Mr. Speaker, the discussions that the House and the Senate have been having recently with regard to the reconciliation budget is a 7-year plan to bring the Government eventually to a balanced budget, or a zero deficit in 7 years. In discussing the budget reconciliation proposal, which is a 7-year plan, there are so many larger issues, such as the \$270 billion reduction in Medicare, \$162 billion cuts in Medicaid, and other programs of that enormity.

In the course of the debate in the budget reconciliation measure last week, we did not hear much about the impacts on education, and so I appreciate the time that is being allotted this evening to discuss the impacts on education, because in my estimation it is probably the most far-reaching and devastating of all the cuts that we are making.

I know that the majority feels very strongly about reallocating the functions of Government, to the idea specifically of returning many of the functions that have been assumed by the Federal Government, many of the priorities that have been expressed by the Federal Government over the last 20 or 30 years, and trying to reassemble them and make them State priorities, under the assumption that the States know best how to govern their constituents and are more directly responsible one to the other.

While that is an excellent political philosophy, it seems wholly inappropriate in the field of education because education, after all, is really tooling one generation to the next generation for leadership, for the ability to assume responsibility, to maintain our quality of life, our ability to compete in the world market, and to discover those things that make our economy and our business and so forth much more competitive.

So in the educational system rests the future of this country, not just individually, for the sake of the child or the family or their prosperity, but truly the whole nature of our society and the success of our country lies in our ability to educate our children well. We know that in recent years, compared to other countries, we have been falling by the wayside.

I look at such things as national security as being, indeed, important. But what is more important than the national domestic security of our citizens through adequate education? That is what the forfeiture of funding in edu-

cation means to me and why I feel that this is a very, very dangerous decision.

If all States were equal in their ability to educate and to provide quality education to their children and adults that need training and education, then perhaps our concerns can be mitigated somewhat by the idea that the States have the capacity and the will to perform in accordance to the national expectations. But we all know that our States are very widely differing in their ability to fulfill this function. One cannot, as a Nation, exercise the luxury of happenstance in terms of the States' abilities to perform. Therefore, the presence of the Federal Government in this important field of education seems to me the most important responsibility that we have to our country and to our future.

So when we see this reconciliation, 7-year balanced budget plan calling for cuts amounting to \$45 billion over the next 7 years, it troubles me deeply that we are sacrificing the future capacity of our children and our adults who are being trained under these programs to meet the challenges of the future. I think that this is a mistaken notion of reversion to State responsibilities.

Even within a State, one can recognize that there are differences in capacities of local communities to assume their responsibilities, and we hear States having to come up with ways in which they can balance out their support for education by giving certain localities additional funds with which to function, because the basis for funding education is the local real property tax, and we know that the values of property differ even within one State. Of course, they differ widely all across the country.

If we are going to put the future of our country in terms of our ability to compete with the rest of the world on this notion of equity distributed by real property taxes, that seems to me wildly off the mark. Therefore, the idea of the Federal interest in supporting educational opportunities in our 50 States is so important.

To see programs like title I, for instance, being cut back, even this 1 year, fiscal year 1996, we are apt to lose almost \$2 billion if we follow the rate of reductions between the House and the Senate versions. These bills are still in conference and the final figures have not been reconciled.

We have a moment in our legislative discussions to rise to the occasion, and to call attention to the House and the Senate and to the conference committees about this dangerous course that we are embarked upon.

Title I, as we know, is a program that allocates funds to our local school districts that have high concentrations of poor people, youngsters that are educationally disadvantaged through economic circumstances or because of other disadvantages that may surround them in their environment and in their community.

Why is it important that the Federal Government support these communities with large concentrations of disadvantaged children? Well, because if we do not, then we will have large blocks of our children in various places throughout the country ill-educated and ill-equipped to perform in this highly technological society. If they are ill-equipped to compete and they are not properly prepared, they will constantly be a cost factor not only for the local communities but also for the Federal Government, so it is important that we target this money in these special communities.

So one would have thought, of all the programs in education, that this would be the last place that there would be any significant cuts. Yet we see nearly a billion, probably a \$2 billion reduction in just 1 year of that program.

For my State, just by State, we only have two Members in the House of Representatives, so that illustrates comparatively the size of my State. Even my State is going to suffer somewhere between a \$1.7 million loss as in the Senate version and a \$3 million loss if it followed the House version.

That is a very big cut for my State to have to endure in a very, very important program which has been successful. One only has to look at the reports that have been written. The criticisms are not from the funding, the criticisms are because it has not been adequately targeted. The maximum bang for the buck has not been achieved because the requirements of the Federal Government have not been as stringent as they should have been.

□ 1515

But nowhere in these reports and critiques is there a suggestion that the Federal Government funding ought not to go. It still is considered a very, very important program.

Addressing the whole subject of quality education and meeting the expectations of the Nation in terms of what education ought to mean to our society, it was important that the Governors convene some years ago a task force on trying to find ways in which the States could direct their resources and come up with a higher quality of education. So they set this Goals 2000 concept. It was brought to the Congress by President Bush, and now implemented by President Clinton, and yet we find that this is one of the programs that the House has chosen to zero out, and that is a shame because one looks to the Federal Government, it seems to me, for leadership. And here we are taking up the recommendations of the Governors' conference and doing precisely what the Governors conference has suggested, putting the Governors themselves really on the governing board of this group called Goals 2000, and yet the House of Representatives majority party has seen fit to zero out this function. It seems to me this is an absolutely appropriate area for the Federal Government to be involved in.

The next one is also equally disturbing, the safe and drug-free schools. The letters that I receive, the critique that has come to my attention from all over the country because I am a member of this committee, suggest that this program is working very, very well. For a small amount of money that the schools receive, they have been able to do a monumental job of trying to instill in our young people the dangers of drug addiction and drug use and how simple it is to develop an attitude and a philosophy of simply rejecting this intervention in your life. So to see this program cut back so drastically, the fiscal year 1995 allocation was \$466 million. The House allocated only a \$200-million figure, and in the budget resolution which came up and which we approved, it zeroed it out, and I think that that is a serious mistake.

So as we look at this whole thing, we see any number of areas which are truly regrettable. Vocational education, as my colleague from California mentioned, an area which is so vital in this dynamically changing technological environment, we need to have vocational programs that constantly train and retrain our workers and adapt them to changing circumstances; the vocational education ought to be retained at its high level of Federal participation.

When we look at education, what do people usually say? The teacher is the central focus of the success of the school or the child or the programs, and so we rest our case upon the quality of teachers, the quality of our educational system, the ways in which our teachers are better equipped to handle their classes, and yet here again we find that the programs have been cut back very drastically.

The President, in the fiscal year 1996 budget, asked for \$735 million for the Eisenhower professional development program. The House only allocated \$500 million. So that is a terrible cut, one that I know will be felt throughout the system.

There is a lot more to be said about the impacts of these cuts, but I notice that my colleague from New York is here, and I would invite him to make his comments at this point, and I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

You know, I certainly agree with everything that she said, and what is really just so shocking about this is that only a year ago it would have been unthinkable to have these kinds of draconian cuts to education.

If you asked the American people how can we best fulfill the future promise of America, they certainly would say that we need to invest in our children's future, that we need to invest in education, that we need to invest in programs for the future, and while we may have some disagreements in Congress over which programs are

important and which programs are more important than others, I do not think that there should be any question that we should be increasing funding for our children's future or our Nation's future for education.

If this appropriations bill is enacted, the education cut would be the largest setback to education in United States history. Education would be cut under the Republican plan by 17 percent, while defense spending is increased by 5 percent, and yet we are still giving the \$270-billion tax break for the rich.

I do not see where the priorities are straight when we are cutting education. Now, this House, 1996 Labor, HHS, Education bill, in my opinion, many of these appropriations bills are horrendous, and to me this is the most horrendous of all the bills. We are cutting education funding by \$4 billion. The budget reconciliation package cuts student aid by \$5 billion over 7 years. My State of New York will lose \$319 million next year and \$2.5 billion over the next 7 years.

Major cuts in education are certainly unwise, and unwise as an economic policy as well, and this legislation, amongst all the terrible things it does, as my colleague from Hawaii points out, this legislation eliminates \$1 billion from Medicaid funds from more than 1 million children with disabilities. New York City will lose \$85 million of that money, and the legislation denies Head Start to 180,000 children in the year 2002 as compared to 1995.

Just last year we were fully funding Head Start, and in a bipartisan approach we were all patting each other on the back to say Head Start is really a program that works. Everyone agreed, and here we are cutting it.

My colleague from Hawaii mentioned we eliminate Goals 2000, the Eisenhower professional development program, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program. What could be more important than a program to ensure that we have safe and drug-free schools? Certainly those of us in urban areas know that we have a problem in our schools, and we should be trying to eradicate the drug problem, not cutting back funds to try to eradicate it.

The legislation cuts bilingual education, vocational education, \$9.5 million in New York State in vocational education, and title I. Title I, in my district, is very, very important because there are a lot of children with low income and the schools rely on title I funding.

We have a 17 percent cut of \$1.1 billion in 1996 in title I funding. Title I funding was put there so that schools that were in poorer areas could get the enrichment, the children in those schools could get the enrichment they deserve. What we are doing is we say we do not really give a darn about the poor and we are just going to cut those funds.

I think in the long run I could go on and on about the things, the terrible things that this bill does, but it is just basically, I think, the wrong approach.

There is fat in the Federal budget. We need to downsize the Federal Government. We need to cut out fat. We need to put programs that work ahead and fund programs that work, and we need to change programs that do not work. But we do not need cuts to education. We do not need the orientation of mortgaging the future of our country by saying that we are not going to continue to expand.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I just wonder how you define the word "cut." How would you define the word "cut"?

Mr. ENGEL. Let me just say to my colleague, we have had this discussion not only in this bill but in Medicaid and Medicare, and you can play with numbers, you can say, well, we are really giving it a small increase or we are cutting back on what we were going to have. To me, the bottom line is this, because we can all play with numbers and can all show statistics, the bottom line is what kind of programs do we have now in 1995-1996, if I just might answer your question, and what are we going to have under this bill in the year 2002?

Mr. HOKE. You are using specific language, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL]. You are using the word "cut." If you are going to use the word "cut," it seems to me it is very confusing to the public. When a family says they are going to cut their spending for the next year, they are spending \$2,000 a month now, next year they are going to spend \$1,850 a month, that is a cut. Is it not true in every single one of these education appropriations we are talking about, the spending goes up from 1996 to 1995?

Mr. ENGEL. No. That is not true.

Mr. HOKE. I will grant you it might not be true in absolutely every case. Certainly, overall the appropriations bill for education is substantially more in 1996 than it is in 1995 and substantially more in 1997 than in 1996, more in 1998 than in 1997. It goes up every single year.

If you want to say we are reducing the rate of increase, if you want to say that we are not spending as much as CBO has said we would be spending a year ago, you are absolutely right. But to suggest we are cutting spending and spending less this year in this education appropriation than we were last year is absolutely wrong.

Mr. ENGEL. Let me just answer the gentleman again. Let me say the bottom line is that we know how much funding we need to keep American education looking forward, to increasing the funding for education that we know our children are going to need so that this Nation is going to have a future, and what I see here when I look at this bill, I look at the Republican plan, is that in each and every aspect that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr.

GENE GREEN] and I have mentioned, we are not going to be able to provide the kinds of services that we set as a priority in the last Congress on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. HOKE. You are absolutely right, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Let me just answer you. When we are going to deny Head Start to 180,000 children in the year 2002, to me, anyway you play with numbers, that is a cut. If we are going to say that children who have disabilities are not going to be able to get the funding, that is a cut. If we are going to eliminate or sharply curtail the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, that is a cut, and we can point to several more instances whereby it is a hard cut, and even if it is not a cut, it is a cut in the services that we will be able to provide for our children because of inflation and because of what we have learned and where we know we have to provide the funds. There is no denying that. There will be a cut in education services to millions of American children, and I personally cannot see that at a time when we are increasing defense spending, giving a huge tax break to the rich. I cannot see us sacrificing education funding for our children.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Reclaiming my time at this point, I still have others to yield to. But let me say that on all of the items that I mentioned, there is a cut in funding for fiscal year 1996 based upon fiscal year 1995.

I am not talking about reductions in anticipated funding. But I want to make sure that everyone understands that in fiscal year 1995, title I was funded at \$6.7 billion. The House-passed bill provides for only \$5.5 billion. If that is not a cut, I cannot understand what a cut is.

Goals 2000, we had \$361 million. The House-passed bill has zero funding. That is obviously a cut.

Safe and drug-free schools in fiscal year 1995 was funded at \$466 million. The House-passed bill was funded at \$200 million. That is a cut, no matter how you look at it.

Bilingual education, we were funded in fiscal year 1995 at \$157 million. The House-passed bill for fiscal year 1996 provides only a \$53 million. That is a cut.

Vocational education in fiscal year 1995 was \$1.1 billion. The House-passed bill provides \$903 million. That is a cut.

The Eisenhower professional development was funded at \$598 million for fiscal year 1995. In fiscal year 1996 the House provided \$500 million.

So all of the programs that have been mentioned here in the special orders, there are clear cuts in the appropriation bills that have cleared this House. Obviously, they are still pending in the Senate.

The point of this special order is to call attention to these cuts, over \$4 billion in total as against fiscal year 1995 spending, and it is not the idea of what more is coming in the future, 7 years.

It is what is being done now to the educational support by the Federal Government in all of these important areas.

□ 1530

I am glad my colleague has raised this point, because it gave me the opportunity to clearly point out that we are talking about cuts in current funding.

I am very happy to yield to my colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Hawaii yielding, and I particularly appreciate the pointed focus of her presentation relating to education. I was in a meeting and then at my office, and I heard the discussion ongoing, and am sorry that the gentleman has offered to not continue to wait on some time to have this discussion, because you were clearly responding to what I think has been misrepresentations about the direction that our Republican colleagues are taking us, and also their arguments there have not been cuts.

I met with a group of educators in the North Forest Independent School District, which is a school district that has brought itself out of both near bankruptcy, but as well out of the doldrums of poor test scores in and around the city of Houston. Clearly the programs that have been drastically cut are the very programs that these educators have utilized to assist their children in excelling. We already know we can tell our children that they can succeed, but these have been bridges that have helped them.

The Goals 2000 programs are particularly unique when it relates to inner city and rural school children, where they do not have the necessary resources. It is well documented that Head Start provides that extra step, if you will, for many of our children who do not have the privileges of preschool education that is paid for by the private sector because of the economic development level of their parents.

The schools also have had a margin of victory with the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program. I do not know why anyone would call that a waste of money. And the \$4 billion cuts overall clearly tell our educators as well as our children that the successes that they have had are not valuable.

The Budget Reconciliation Act that cuts these proposals is misdirected. Vocational education, the school-to-work programs that have been so successful for some of our youngsters who are not directly interested and or prepared for a liberal arts college education.

I heard earlier the Democrats were being accused of supporting a myriad of job training programs; we do not know which ones we want. I might tell my colleague, the gentleman who was on the floor previously, that we have already consolidated job programs. We have already done an inventory of the effective ones and the noneffective

ones, and we can be assured that we have programs that have proven to be successful.

The gentlewoman has been a stalwart spokesperson for real welfare reform. How do you reform welfare if you do not give that dependent mother or father an opportunity for job training and for work?

So when we begin to talk about cutting, I am wondering whether my Republican colleagues understand the word "investment," because when you invest in job training, education, then you prepare yourselves for the diminishing of welfare rolls, you prepare yourself for people to be tuned into the work force of the 21st century, you prepare yourself for work.

Mr. Speaker, I would compliment the gentlewoman, and I would thank her for allowing me to bring this to a point of acknowledging the drastic and devastating impact that this will have in my local community.

I close simply by saying part of the cuts that have come about in the education cuts and the job training cuts comes I think as one of the most telling and also the most destructive cuts, because of the negative discussion around it, and that was summer youth jobs that many of us have seen work, because they are partnerships between the public and private sector.

I was on the floor earlier talking about that, because it hurts so much to tell a youngster it is only a baby-sitting job, you were not learning anything from being exposed at an energy company or in a local government office or in the parks department or somewhere else where you have seen that work counts and work is important.

I think and hope that in this budget reconciliation process, even as short as it is, that we give life to the idea that we can balance the budget in a better way, less mean spirited, but we can invest in our people so that we will not have this occurrence as we move into the 21st century.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her contribution. It is very important that we have this kind of focus on the significance of the cuts in education.

I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her taking this time on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I join this debate to point out some impacts that are now starting to be felt in the State of California, and that is with our superintendent of public instruction. Delaine Easton has written to our delegation explaining her very deep concern with the cuts in the education budget, both those which are in the Health and Human Services appropriations bill and the budget cuts.

California stands to lose some \$260 million under the budget now being

considered in the conference discussions with the administration. In her words, this is catastrophic for our State. Our State, which has the obligation to educate a very diverse school population that is beset with the whole series of problems that confront many of our large States, are simply not going to be able to do that job in an adequate fashion. When I say in an adequate fashion, I am simply talking about people having the ability to perform at grade level in the basics of education, in reading and writing and mathematics and critical thinking skills.

The growing evidence is that a growing number of students across our State and across this country are simply not becoming proficient in those very basic skills, those skills which are necessary if these students are going to be able to take their place in the American economy and if they are going to be able to adapt to the changing economy once they have their place in the job market.

We see evidence of this now in the State college system. In the State of California, some 60 percent of the entrants in the State college system are in need of remedial education. The frightening part is this is from I believe the top 30 percent of the students who graduate from high school in our State. So now we find ourselves spending money on some of the highest paid professors to deal with remedial education problems that should have been dealt with quite properly at the 4th and 5th and 6th grade of education. But as our superintendent of public instruction tells us, the likelihood of that now happening with these budget cuts is placed in jeopardy.

That is not to suggest that this is a problem of money alone, because it is not. But it is also to strongly suggest, as she does in her communications to the members of our delegation, that the corrective actions necessary in terms of school reform, in terms of accountability, in terms of teacher proficiency, in terms of reducing the administrative bureaucracy, are all placed in jeopardy by these budget cuts. They make all of the tasks of our educational system in California far more difficult.

This does not even begin to speak to the problem of the capital assets of our elementary and secondary education systems in the State of California, where we now find our children, the children that we keep claiming are so important to the future of this country, that we believe are the most important asset of the future of this country, we are now sending them to schools that are dilapidated, that are run down, that are not capable of being properly wired for new technologies, for computer access for these students, where students are constantly confronted with water coming through the ceiling.

That is a whole other issue. But as the State struggles with that, if it

loses this kind of program money, if it loses this kind of assistance that generates additional assistance at the State level and at the local level to provide for extra reading help and mathematics tutoring, computer equipment, special training for teachers, all of which every independent report in assessing the American education system and the California education system, done by the California Roundtable, done by our business community, to look at this educational system, none of them have suggested that resources to that system should be reduced. They have all suggested that resources going to that system should be reorganized and should be used more efficiently. But the monies that you gain from the efficient use of that reorganization should be plowed back into that system so that we can better educate a larger number of the children.

Those are not the conclusions that I have reached. Those are not the conclusions that the California Teachers Association has reached or the school principals have reached. Those are the conclusions of independent blue ribbon commissions, dominated in many instances by the business community, who have looked at these systems, have looked at these institutions and said we have a major problem simply in the sufficiency of the resources available to these institutions.

So when we see budgets that are passed by the House of Representatives that are talking about a 17-percent reduction over 7 years in these budgets, we are talking about a trickle down of a critical problem for local education.

Interestingly enough, we find that people in my home community of Martinez and many other communities that I represent in my congressional district, they are voting to try to raise what resources they can in the community to improve school facilities, to try to provide technological improvements to the education system. But at the same time they are making this effort, that they are voting with their pocketbook, what they see is a reduction in resources from the Federal Government. It is not only unwise, but I think it flies in the face of what parents have said they want for their children. I think we have an obligation to take these programs that have been highly successful and make sure that they in fact are delivered to the students of our State and of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank again the gentlewoman for taking this time, and I just want to say that I think superintendent Delaine Easton makes a very forceful case to the Members of the delegation to give very, very strict scrutiny to the cuts that have been made in the education budget and to understanding the impacts as they drift down to the local district level in the State of California.

We have a huge obligation and responsibility to our students to make them world class graduates, and to be

proficient at a world class level in the basics of education and in critical thinking. All of the evidence suggests we will not meet that responsibility and obligation to our students with the educational budget and the trendlines that are put in place by the budget adopted by the House and the Senate.

I would hope that the President would reject it. Should we eventually get to the Health and Human Services appropriations bill, I would hope that Members of Congress would vote against that, I would hope that the President would veto it, and I would hope that we sustain his veto so we can negotiate decent levels of education funding for our children and for our families who have such high aspirations and hopes and desires for their children's education and for their ability to provide for their economic wherewithal in the American economic system.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution in this debate. I concur with the gentleman absolutely that if the conference bill in this area comes back anywhere near what I have just described, the only thing that is left for us to do is to defeat that bill and hope that the Congress concurs with our opinion. If not, if it should pass, I certainly hope that the President will veto it, and the House will surely sustain that veto.

This is an area of critical importance. I cannot emphasize our feelings about this in any stronger terms. I believe fervently that we represent the majority of people in this country that are committed to the Federal participation in education. If we could have a referendum, I am sure that our point of view would be more than supported. I hope that point of view will be recognized by the Members who are conferees on the conference committee, and that we will have an opportunity to restore this funding.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the proposed cuts in education.

I have listened to Member after Member come to the well and say time after time that we must protect the future of the children of tomorrow and their children.

In reality, Members on the other side of the aisle are jeopardizing our children's future.

How can you guarantee the future if you don't take care of the children of today?

The new majority is cutting education so it can give tax breaks to the rich and spend more on defense.

If the Members on the other side of the aisle were really serious about balancing the budget to ensure the prosperity of future generations, they would do it responsibly.

They would not slash the programs that help the young, the old, the poor, and the middle class.

If they truly wanted to help our kids succeed, they would make an investment in education, not eliminate the support that schools depend upon.

In fiscal year 1995, California received \$2.5 billion from the Federal Government for education.

Under legislation crafted by the new House majority, California would lose \$392 million in fiscal year 1996, and stands to lose a total of \$2.59 billion over 7 years.

In fiscal year 1996, there would be \$42.4 million less for Pell grants for college, \$42.1 million less for local school reform, \$122.3 million less for services for disadvantaged children, \$26.4 million less for safe and drug-free schools, \$18.4 million less for vocational education, and \$5 million less for teacher training.

Come on now, who's taking care of whom. The new majority is taking care of the rich and ignoring the children of today.

If they're worrying about the children of tomorrow then they would take care of the children of today.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the special order just presented.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1545

THE IMPORTANCE OF A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk this afternoon about the budget, about some of the things we have just heard regarding that, about what the importance is of a balanced budget, and I want to recognize a great fighter pilot, former, a great American, great Member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and a Californian as well, because I know that he has some important things to say about education, and education particularly in California.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as a former fighter pilot.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And I still am flying fighters, so there is no such thing as a former fighter pilot.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on some of the things my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said. I agree with one thing they said, there are some very, very good schools out there. I have some of the finest schools in Torrey Pines and San Dieguito, all up and down in my particular area. They would compete with any school in the Nation. But across the board our schools are not.

We pour billions of dollars into that but, Mr. Speaker, less than 12 percent

of our classrooms have even a single phone jack for fiber optics or computers or software or the programs we need to put in there.

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are really talking about is power. Washington-based power in education. When they say we are cutting Goals 2000, the Federal power of Goals 2000 has been cut to zero. Absolutely correct. But we send the money, block grant it to the States, and the Governors have told us that they can run those programs more efficiently than letting the Government talk about it with their rules and regulations.

We only control about 7 percent of the funding for our schools in this Nation out of the Federal Government. Seven percent. But with that 7 percent comes over 50 percent of the regulations and 75 percent of the paperwork to the States. We are eliminating that, Mr. Speaker, and we are giving that power to the State.

If the State wants to run a Goals 2000 without all the bureaucrats in Washington, without having to file all the reports, without having to go through all the paperwork, they can do it, and they have the funds to do it and it is much more efficient. To say we cut Goals 2000 is not a fact. It is there. It is at the State level.

Second, let us look at the perspective of California. We have less than 12 percent of our classrooms across the Nation, as I mentioned, that have a single phone jack. Seven percent of education, again, comes out of the Federal Government. We get less than 25 cents on the dollar back down into the classroom because of all the bureaucracy. What we are doing is eliminating that bureaucracy and absolutely on the Federal level we are cutting it and taking that power out of Washington and the Democrats' ability to spend money so that they can get reelected, so that they can have the power, and we are giving it back to the States.

Mr. Speaker, I think there would be a legitimate complaint if the Republicans were taking that power and shifting it over to themselves, but they are not. They are shifting it back to the people where Government is closer to the people and more effective. But we hear time and time again from the other side of the aisle that the States do not know how to manage their own problems, only the liberals here in the Congress know best for what is good for the individual States. We will hear it over and over again, but we feel differently, Mr. Speaker.

I look at the State of California, and look at how they have destroyed education. One example. The liberals voted to cut defense \$177 billion. California is one of the leaders in defense. We have lost a million jobs with base closures and defense cuts. Ninety-three percent of education is paid for out of the tax dollars of the State. That is a million people. Say that half of them got jobs, probably not as good as they were in the defense industry, but take that out