

other figures, celebrities, many in the sports arena, politics, the arts, show business in paying tribute to Herb. I do not know of any other person, living person, who has had such a tribute, who can make that claim.

His funeral took place this past Friday, and thousands of people attended. In the evening there was a candlelight march after work for the many people who could not take time off during the day, along Herb Caen Way, to honor him. It is very hard to explain to our colleagues a person so special that tens of thousands of people would turn out for him in life and in death, but he lived as he had died, surrounded by friends.

So I once again on the floor of this House want to extend my deepest sympathy to Herb's wife, Ann Caen; his son, Christopher; and Stacy, Steven and Catherine. It is a very difficult time for them and for all of San Francisco, the area which considered itself part of Herb's family.

Our mayor, Willie Brown, said it best when he said Herb Caen is irreplaceable. Again, as I say, because he was so special, it may be hard for our colleagues to understand the esteem in which he was held. The mayor called him irreplaceable. I will borrow the words of W.H. Auden, with some poetic license, to try to give expression to the sadness of our community on the death of Herb Caen:

Stop all the clocks, cut off the telephone,
prevent the dog from barking with the juicy
bone, silence the pianos and with muffled
drum bring out Herb's friends, let the
mourners come.

Let airplanes circle moaning overhead,
scribbling on the sky the message he is gone.
Put crepe bows around the white necks of
the public doves, let the traffic policemen
wear black cotton gloves.

He was, in our community, he was our
North, our South, our East and our West, our
working week and our Sunday rest. Our
moon, our midnight, our talk, our song; we
thought that he would last forever, but we
were wrong.

The stars are not wanted now; put out
every one: Pack up the moon and dismantle
the sun; pour away the ocean and sweep up
the woods: for nothing can ever come to any
good.

I do not agree with that last line.
Herb would certainly want his leaving
to come to some good.

On his Herb Caen Day he said when
he died and, hopefully, went to heaven,
when he got there he would say of
heaven "It ain't bad but it ain't San
Francisco."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a
previous order of the House, the gentle-
man from New Jersey [Mr. Saxton]
is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SAXTON addressed the House.
His remarks will appear hereafter in
the Extensions of Remarks.]

TOUCH THE FUTURE: INVEST IN EDUCATION

(Mrs. McCARTHY of New York asked
and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise
and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr.
Speaker, I have spent the last week
traveling throughout my district in
Mineola, Garden City, Uniondale on
Long Island, and meeting with hun-
dreds of children. I have visited their
classrooms, met their teachers, and
watched them work on computers, lis-
tened to their lessons and heard them
read their books.

These children are full of enthusiasm
and spark. They want to learn and they
are enjoying it. These are visits that
have made more clear to me that our
children are one of our Nation's most
precious resources.

I saw a bumper sticker recently that
said, "I touch the future. I teach." In
Congress we can also touch the future
by improving our educational system
and making college more affordable for
working families. And those who
choose not to go to college, let us not
forget them. We want to make sure
that they have good and well-paying
job opportunities.

Let us pass President Clinton's 8-
point educational plan, which includes
a \$10,000 tax deduction for tuition and
training as well as a plan for 2-year,
\$1,000 Hope scholarships. It is impor-
tant for our children's future. Let us do
it.

ANSWER TO EDUCATION PROBLEMS NOT IN WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the Speaker's announced policy of Janu-
ary 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michi-
gan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] will be recognized
for 40 minutes and the gentleman from
Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] will be recog-
nized for 20 minutes as the designees of
the majority leader.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman
from Michigan, [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, today
we continue a discussion that began in
1996. It deals with this city. This is a
picture of Washington, DC. And it deals
with what we really can expect Wash-
ington to do and the kind of balance
that we need to strive for in this coun-
try between what we expect from
Washington, what we expect from the
private sector, what we expect from in-
dividuals, and perhaps what we can ex-
pect from faith-based and religious and
volunteer organizations in America.

In many cases, I believe we have
moved too much power to this town.
We have asked Washington to do all
kinds of things that perhaps it is not
best equipped to do. We saw some of
this last week when we heard the
President articulate a vision for edu-
cation, a vision that I believe moves
power, authority, and control from the
local level, from the parental level
back to this community, back to this
town, and it says the way we improve
education in America is we empower
Washington and we empower the bu-
reaucrats in Washington to make deci-
sions.

We used this chart for the first time
or this picture for the first time in 1996
when we talked about the crisis that
this Nation was facing in welfare. Be-
cause what we had done in welfare is
we had moved decisionmaking away
from the local level, where we were
best equipped to help those in need,
and we moved it to Washington.

We moved it to buildings here in
Washington, so that when the State of
Michigan or when the State of Wiscon-
sin wanted to design a program that
they felt best met the needs of their
citizens, they had to come to a building
over here and a bureaucrat in Washing-
ton, who had maybe never been in Wis-
consin, maybe never been in California,
maybe never been in Michigan, and say
"Can I do this in my State?" And the
bureaucrats in Washington were em-
powered to make the decisions.

Yesterday I had the opportunity to
meet with a new program in the State
of Michigan, where in my home county
they are working on what they call
Project Zero, which is to move every-
body off of welfare. It is a partnership.
It is a partnership between local agen-
cies, it is a partnership with the State,
and it is a partnership in a volunteer
way with faith-based institutions to
reach out and embrace those families
that need help and to lift them up in a
permanent and in a meaningful way off
of welfare.

Those are the kinds of programs that
I expect we will see over the next 12, 18,
24 months that will have a dramatic
improvement in the welfare situation
in this country.

Now, after we have made that change
in welfare, which moves power back
from Washington, back to the States
and, more important, back to the local
communities where we can have these
creative mergers of people coming to-
gether to help others in the commu-
nity, we find that the President does
not really believe that the era of big
government is over. He now believes
that the era of big government has
moved from a failure in welfare, and it
is kind of like we did not learn our les-
son: We are going to take that bureau-
cracy now and create and expand the
Department of Education.

Over the last 9 months we have had
hearings around the country, and we
know that that model does not work.
We know that the model of moving
power to Washington and moving
power to bureaucrats in Washington is
not the answer. These bureaucrats are
knowledgeable, talented people, but
they cannot address the problems at
the local level.

In hearings that we have had in New
York City, that we have had in Chi-
cago, that we have had in Cleveland,
that we had a couple of weeks ago in
Los Angeles and Phoenix, the answer is
very clear. The way that we improve
education is we empower parents, we
move decisionmaking back to the local
level, we focus on basic academics, and
we drive dollars back into the class-
room and not into a bureaucracy and

into bureaucrats, as well-meaning as they may be.

The system today is fairly clear and what the President proposes is fairly clear. It is the myth. It is the myth of the magical President who believes that by having good intentions in Washington and outlining wonderful-sounding programs, and moving dollars to Washington and moving responsibility to Washington, we can actually solve the problems that we have in education.

There is no doubt that in certain parts of our country education is in crisis, if we take a look at some of the statistics. This is not a debate about whether we need to improve education or whether we need to put a focus on education. The statistics are clear: One-half of all adult Americans are functionally illiterate.

Two weeks ago we had a hearing in California. Think about it: Twenty-five percent of the students that enter higher education in the State of California need remedial education. This is kids in 8th grade, this is kids in 10th grade, these are kids going into higher education. Twenty-five percent of them, when they enter the institution of higher education, need remedial education.

What does that mean? That means that they are entering into college and they cannot read or write at an 8th grade level. Sixty-four percent of 12th graders do not read at a proficient level. In international comparisons U.S. students scored worse in math than any other country except for Jordan.

If we take a look outside of this building in Washington, DC, it is also not an issue of money. We spend about \$8,300 per child in the city of Washington, DC, and we have some of the lowest test scores in the country. In the State of Michigan we spend about \$5,400 per student. So it is not let us pour more money into these programs or into these cities, it is let us focus on the basics.

When we have gone around the country, the exciting thing that we have noticed is that we can go into many areas that we would identify as having at-risk kids, the kids that maybe when we take a look at their environment and a whole series of factors we might be saying they are at risk, and they are at risk because maybe they are in an environment where it is most difficult for them to learn. The exciting thing about this is, as we go into these areas we see schools, we see teachers and we see parents and, most importantly, we see some of the greatest kids in this country, and they are learning and they are learning successfully.

But it is because of the schools, and it does not make a difference whether it is a public school or a private school or whether it is a charter school. We have seen examples of all of these, but when the schools make a commitment to involve the parents, where they have been freed from the rules and regula-

tions from Washington and from the State so that the teachers and the administration can focus on the kids rather than the rules and regulations, it works. When the dollars go into the classroom rather than into paperwork, it works, and when the schools are focusing on basic academics, it works.

□ 1430

Here is the system today, and here is why I am leery about sending more money to Washington and why I believe it is a myth and why I believe that in the area of education, at least in Washington, more does not mean better.

Remember what we have in Washington today when we say education. Washington has been trying to help in the area of education for the last 20 years. Twenty years of work, 760 different programs running through 39 different agencies, spending about \$120 billion per year. Washington has been going after this problem, but we have not been doing it very successfully.

Why? What is the process? Well, we start with parents, which is where we should start. We should have focus on parents and kids. But when we move the education system and the focus of education to Washington, we end up getting a whole bunch of layers in between parents, kids and teachers and local school boards.

In Washington, in this model that some want to expand, we have parents paying into Washington about \$120 billion, into Washington programs, into Washington bureaucracies, 760 different programs. We are worried about reading and writing? Washington, a couple of years ago, had 32 different literacy programs. We still have more than 14 literacy programs. \$120 billion into 760 programs, 39 different agencies.

Then the Washington bureaucracy, all the arrows point one way in terms of putting rules and regulations and dollars back on State and local school boards, but what happens when we create a program? If you create a program, somebody has to find out about it, so we spend dollars communicating to a school board or to a State saying, "We've got these dollars available for these kinds of programs."

So we invest dollars in a communications effort. School boards find out about it; they do not automatically get it. They have to now say, "I wonder if we qualify for this? What do we need to do to qualify for this? How do we apply?"

They then fill out applications, and it goes back to the bureaucracy. The bureaucrats in Washington say, "Well, you know, we've got x amount of dollars, we've got so many school districts applying. We're going to have to go through a sorting process to decide who gets this money and who does not."

So they go through a decisionmaking process in the awarding of grants. The Vice President's National Performance Review outlined that in one of these

grant applications in the Department of Education the process went through 487 different steps to move dollars from Washington actually back to a school board, back actually to the kids.

Washington then sends money to a school board or to a local school district. Of course, we cannot trust the people at the local level to do what we ask them to do, so of course we have rules and regulations and we have reporting structures back into Washington that says, "Yes, we received your money," and "Yes, here is proof that we spent it exactly the way you wanted us to." We in Washington, of course, cannot believe those, so we have to put in place an auditing program that says, "Make sure you keep your records, because we may want to come back and audit that you actually spent the money the way we intended you to spend it."

The bottom line is when parents send \$120 billion to Washington and they funnel it through the 760 programs that we lose at least, conservatively we lose at least 15 cents of the Federal dollar. If you take a look at how much we lose at the State and the local level as they go through the process of applying and meeting the rules and regulations in the local cost, we probably lose somewhere in the neighborhood of 35 to 40 cents of each and every education dollar that goes to Washington to funnel it back.

We are not getting the money into the classroom. Most of this money or a good portion of it, probably 35 to 40 percent of the dollars that we think we are investing in education, gets sucked up into the bureaucracy and into the paperwork, and what happens is rather than school boards focusing on and working with parents as to what they need to do in their local district, what we have created is a model that says, kids are important, but I need to meet the rules, the requirements and the regulations from Washington. So their focus goes to a bureaucracy in Washington and not to parents and not on kids.

We have got to break the cycle. We have to focus on what is important, the basics, local and parental control and getting dollars into the classroom. We need to focus and we need a model where the people who are involved in education and setting the direction for education for our kids are parents, kids, and local leaders in the community.

I can say that with conviction because of the success we have seen around the country. We visited the Vaughn Charter School in L.A. 2 weeks ago, south central Los Angeles, one of the lowest performing schools when it was part of the Unified Los Angeles School District. It is now a charter school. It is still a public school. It is still accountable to the taxpayers. But what they did when they became a charter school, they cut the strings of bureaucracy. Dr. Chan, who is heading that school, saved the school district,

and the number is a little bit disputed, but somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1.5 million. But more importantly, talking to the parents, talking to the kids, going into the classrooms, sitting around a table and talking about what makes this school different today, the parents, Dr. Chan, and the students are all saying it is because this is the model.

The model is one where the school, the principal, and the teachers have a partnership with the parents, and they are focused on the kids. Parents talk about we got our school back. As a matter of fact, it is now a neighborhood school. The kids in this neighborhood were being bused all over. The kids now have the choice of where they want to go to school. They are now going back to this school. They not only took control of the school back for the parents, but it is now a neighborhood school and in a very rough part of Los Angeles. It is kind of like a bright beacon in that community about what a local community can do when it cuts the strings from a bureaucracy and is empowered to take over a small part of its own community, and it is empowered to take over a very important part of its community, which is the schools.

There are a couple of other interesting statistics when we talk about what happens when dollars go into Washington.

We know we lose at least 15 cents here in Washington and we know that we lose at least another 20 cents when you go to the costs incurred by the local schools and the State, but it is kind of interesting how these dollars get distributed. Dollars do not follow kids. Dollars go all over the place.

If you are in Alaska, sending dollars to Washington and increasing the Washington bureaucracy is a good deal, because even though you maybe lose 40 cents of every dollar you send to Washington, with Alaska, when you send \$1 in, you get \$3.12 back. So the dollars coming in, the share back to you is very positive. It is a disproportionate share back to Alaska.

If you are in Connecticut, it does not really pay. Connecticut gets all of 39 cents back to that State. If you are in Mississippi, you get \$2.41, if you are in New Mexico, you get \$2.34. If you are close to New Mexico, in Nevada, too bad, you only get 39 cents back.

So it is a huge shell game in Washington that is not focused on kids. It is not focused on improving education. It is focused on bureaucrats and politicians trying to do something that really parents and local school districts can do a whole lot better.

As we take a look at this, this system does not work, when we take a look at what is going on and some of the proposals that the President has to improve learning, to improve education. It is interesting, one of the proposals he has, and I have oversight over this area, is the President proposes \$809 million for the Corporation for Na-

tional and Community Service. National and community service. It sounds great. Our volunteers through the Corporation for National Service cost us as taxpayers about \$27,000 apiece, or as high as \$27,000. They are going to go out and they are going to get tutors. I think that is a laudable objective. Schools are doing this today. Community groups are involved, and I am not sure what the Federal Government can do to help and assist in that process.

We fund and send money through the Corporation for National Service, and it would be one thing if we knew where now another roughly \$1 billion going into this model, we know we are going to lose some of that in the structure and in the hierarchy and in the bureaucracy. We also know that, at least for the Corporation for National Service and for many of these other agencies, we are not actually going to know where the money goes.

The Corporation for National Service, this is an agency that spends about \$600 to \$700 million per year. The books still are not auditable. Think about it. Sending taxpayer dollars to an agency that was set up and was going to be the model for a government agency and how government should run but cannot have an independent accounting firm come in and audit its books.

That is one example. The Heritage Foundation cites a number of other examples that says these 760 programs do not have the kind of oversight necessary to determine whether they work and where the dollars are going and whether they are efficient or not. Is it not interesting that we know we have a problem in reading, we know that our kids are not reading at competitive standards, that in certain States a high percentage of them need remedial education, and rather than focusing on the real problem as to why kids are not learning in the classroom, the response in Washington is to create another program.

We have known that this has been an issue. We have got 14 literacy programs. And now what we are doing is we are funding an overlay of perhaps volunteers reading 2 hours per day or 2 hours per week with students, but we are not asking the fundamental questions as to why are kids not learning to read in the classroom.

Is there something going on in the classroom that is prohibiting kids from learning? Why do we not take a look at what is going on in the classroom before we do anything else, and maybe moving dollars into the classroom is a more effective way of addressing this problem than putting another Band-Aid on an open wound. Maybe we ought to go back and take a look at the 14 literacy programs that are already spending over \$8 billion per year from a Washington level and saying, why are those 14 literacy programs not driving the kinds of results that we would like to have?

□ 1445

If they are good programs and they are working, why are we not putting more money into those programs? If those programs are not working and we do not feel we should be putting more money into them, but we should be going in this new route or in a different route, why do we not take a look at eliminating those programs and getting true effectiveness into the system? But no, the proposal that we have in front of us is more bureaucracy in Washington, not critically evaluating the programs that we have in place.

Well, that is not going to work in this Congress.

We do have in place a program which we call Crossroads in Education. The Crossroads in Education project that is coming out of the Committee on Education and the Workforce is going to do, and is in the process of doing, a critical analysis of these 760 programs. We want to find out where the dollars go; are they getting results or are they not getting results; how can we make them more effective; and what is working and what is wasted in education today?

So what does that mean? It means that the first step is last year we asked the question: How many programs are there? Nobody had ever asked that question before. We did some work, we did some research; some other outside organizations, some parts of the executive branch helped us. They said 760 programs, 39 agencies—actually the 760 is a little old. Since that point in time they have identified about a hundred more programs that we have. So it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 850 to 900 programs that we really have in Washington.

But we are now going through and we are asking what is the process; how is this money distributed; what are the actual links back and forth between a bureaucracy and the State and a local school board; how are people awarded and granted dollars; what is the largest grant request you get or that you gave out; what is the smallest?

We found a grant request for safe and drug-free schools. The school district went through all of the work, a very thick application, and I will tell you they got their money's worth. They got a grant for \$13. The Government cannot even write a check for \$13, but that is what the school district got. Maybe that went out and would have paid for lunch for the person who spent considerable time putting this grant request together: \$13 for a school district to develop their safe and drug-free school program.

Think of the costs that went in. We are doing that. What is the largest and the smallest grant request you got? What do these grant requests look like? Are they 2 pages, are they 50 pages? In some cases we found that they may be a thousand pages. How much time and energy? What happens to the grant requests when they come to Washington? How are they sorted

through? Who reads them? You then go back and you take a look at when the grants go out, how much paperwork?

The statistics I believe that we had in our hearing in Arizona 2 weeks ago was that of the 6 percent—let me find the exact quote—this was from Lisa Graham Keegan who is Arizona's superintendent of education—said, I will say that the 8 percent Arizona receives from the Federal Government easily accounts for more than 50 percent of the work in my department and school districts.

The paperwork. They receive 8 percent of their money—remember this \$120 billion is only about 5 or 6 percent of what any school district gets, but on a national average some get more, some get less. Here in Arizona it is about 8 percent of their total dollars come from Washington and about 50 percent of their paperwork. Is that a good investment? What do bureaucrats in Washington really know about what needs to be done in Arizona?

So what is the paperwork that goes back and forth? We have had meetings, and we asked superintendents to tell us about their paperwork, and one of the things that they keep coming back with is, we appreciate the money we get from Washington. In some cases it does some good and we can work in those areas. But the real problem is when we take a look at our local school district and we take a look at the needs that we have. If we had more flexibility to use that money in different ways, we would spend it in different ways than what you are mandating that we spend it on.

So we know that this process is not an ideal process. Fifty billion dollars of more spending in Washington is not the way to improve education. Spending \$50 on education may be a worthwhile effort. It is probably a good exercise. Spending it at the State and the local level, where you have more control and direction about what you need in your community, and actually getting the dollars into the classroom probably makes a lot more sense.

Recognize that when we spend and say we are going to spend \$50 billion in Washington, maybe only 25 to 30 billion will actually make it back into the classroom. Twenty billion is going to get lost somewhere else in the process.

A couple of other proposals that the President is talking about that I think need serious consideration: talking about school construction. As soon as we put in Federal dollars, any amount of Federal dollars, into a local school construction, Washington will come in and mandate what contractors need to be paid on an hourly basis for the work that they perform in your school district. It is called Davis-Bacon, mandated from Washington what you will pay. We have an elaborate system in the Department of Labor that is not very good but that tries to track wages in thousands of different communities around this Nation, in a number of different construction categories, and

that is what you have to pay. In other projects where you do not have Davis-Bacon, we go through this kind of complex way of determining how much a project will cost. It is called competitive bidding. School districts cannot competitively bid. They have to pay Davis-Bacon wages.

So in effect, when you go on a construction project with Federal dollars or partially funded with Federal dollars, you lose again about 15 percent of your purchasing power by being required to pay the wages established here in Washington versus what you may be able to get in a competitive bid.

I enjoy the discussion about the HOPE scholarships. Making education available to more students on a longer basis I think is a worthwhile goal, saying that Washington is now going to provide scholarships for those that maintain a B average.

The IRS today cannot track our income tax system, our Income Tax Code. Just think of what wonderful work they are now going to have also trying to match tax deductions with information from schools indicating that, yes, these people did maintain a B average and that B averages across the country are consistent, so that the same B that you get in Michigan is equivalent to a B that you get in Arizona.

It is going to create a lot more work for bureaucrats, and it is going to move a lot less money into the classroom.

The evidence is clear. We need to focus on education, but more compelling is the case that rather than increasing and building and expanding this city in Washington, the keys to improving education is moving dollars and power away from this city and moving it back to parents, moving it back to local school boards and empowering teachers.

It is not only school boards. It is teachers that want control of their classroom. It is the parents that want their schools back. They do not want to come to Washington to take a look or to fight for what they want to do in their classroom. They want control of their schools. They know specifically what they need for their kids and their community.

The needs of this country are so diverse. We need to be able to have the flexibility to tailor the programs for our kids from one city and one community to the next, and we need to empower parents.

That is not a concept or a theory. We know that it works. Take a look at the schools that are working, take a look at the schools that are excelling, and that is the bright spot in the picture in education.

Yes, there is some bad news, there is some information that says we ought to be worried about this and that in some parts of the Nation education may be in a state of crisis. But the good news is that we can look at models of success and we can learn from

those models of success, we can learn what the characteristics are, and we can then tailor Federal policies and rules and regulations, or whatever, to empower that kind of change and reform to happen at the local level.

And what we learn is very simple: Parents, basics and getting dollars into the classroom, empowering parents instead of empowering bureaucrats, dollars to kids, not to bureaucracy, fundamental basic education, not the latest education fads; it is a key issue, it is an important issue. It is going to be a vigorous debate. I think in the end kids and parents will win, and politicians and bureaucrats in Washington will lose. That is the system that works, that is the model that we will build on, and that is the direction that we need to go.

PROPOSING A TERM LIMITS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I come today to speak about a subject that will be greatly debated tomorrow on the floor of the House; that is, term limits. I am the author of House Joint Resolution 2 which will be out here on the floor. It is the term limits amendment for 12 years in the U.S. Senate, 12 years in the U.S. House, something that better than 70 percent of the American people in principle support.

The issue that will be before us will be a historic debate, the second time that we have heard the subject of term limits debated in the Congress of the United States. First time was in the 104th Congress, 2 years ago when this amendment that I offered received 227 votes, which is a simple majority, more than a simple majority because 218 is that, but not enough to reach the required supermajority of 290 votes to pass a constitutional amendment in the House.

I am hopeful that when we conclude the debate tomorrow that this amendment will receive more than the 227 votes it received last year, that we will be further progressing toward the 290 votes that we need for the ultimate passage of this amendment, even though I have no illusions that we have yet to reach the numbers in the House who support term limits sufficient to actually pass this amendment tomorrow.

I am hopeful that the debate will be centered primarily upon the divisive issues that normally we debate here; that is, those who favor a differing length of term and those who favor no term limits at all.

There are those who favor 6-year House terms and 12 years in the Senate, and I respect that view. There is certainly a difference of opinion we can