

that occurred and blaming it on NAFTA. We did not say that because so many people in America got a cold or the flu it was NAFTA's fault, just because a factory closed down here and closed down there, it was NAFTA's fault. We did not make that point.

We wanted to be wrong. We were hoping that the promises of 200,000 jobs that were made by the proponents of NAFTA would take place and that many of those jobs would occur in the gentleman's district in Michigan and my district in Pennsylvania and some of our other friends in Ohio and California and across this country.

□ 2030

That was our hope. Unfortunately, that has not occurred.

As my friend pointed out, what really we have seen is promises broken. All of those companies, many of those companies which came out making all kinds of promises, telling us all of the wonderful things that were going to occur, we called them the NAFTA poster companies. They would come out with fancy flyers saying we are going to create these jobs. Indeed, 60 of the 67 companies that made specific promises about jobs that would be created, in fact have not fulfilled those promises of job creation. In many instances they have eliminated jobs. Some of those companies are no longer even doing business with Mexico.

The gentleman's point about the fact that when NAFTA passed we had a small \$1.7 billion a year trade surplus with Mexico, and now we have a booming trade deficit with Mexico, I would remind all of my colleagues this occurs, Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are including as exports to Mexico the factory equipment that we are sending down there by companies that have closed down their factories in this country and are moving that factory equipment and those jobs to Mexico. That counts as a surplus. That counts as goods that we are selling to Mexico. That is not legitimate goods and services. Those will, in fact, be used against us.

The increase of the U.S. trade deficit with Mexico and Canada has cost, we believe, about 420,000 jobs. Half a million jobs.

Mr. BONIOR. Good paying jobs, in many instances.

Mr. KLINK. The gentleman is correct. These were good paying jobs. And as the gentleman said, when these workers were displaced they did not get good paying jobs.

My State of Pennsylvania is one of the top two in NAFTA trade adjustment assistance applications. For those people that do not understand, that is a very complex procedure that you qualify or you apply for benefits based on the fact that you lost your job because of NAFTA. Not everyone who has lost their job because of NAFTA has qualified for NAFTA TA benefits or even applied for them. So this is only one part of the puzzle when we try to

determine the precise number of jobs that we have lost in this country. That is very convoluted.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman makes a good point. And the other piece I want to talk about for just a second with him is, it was 60-some percent, I think it was 65 percent I mentioned, of people who lost their jobs as a result of NAFTA and jobs moving to Mexico, people who have found other jobs have found them at lower pay. If an individual was making maybe \$12 an hour, they may have found another job but it may be at \$7 or \$8 an hour.

So what happens when that occurs in a family? Their standard of living is diminished considerably, so they go out and get another job. They have 2 jobs, 3 jobs, to make sure that income level in the family is where it had been. What does that do?

Mr. KLINK. If the gentleman will yield, that is when they find out they have less time to put into their family and their community.

Mr. BONIOR. That is correct. They are not there for soccer for their kids, they are not there after school when their kids come home, or to help with PTA and the other community efforts. That is the untold factor here that we are dealing with as a result of this downward pressure on wages and job loss.

I thank my colleague for raising that point.

Mr. KLINK. When we heard all of these predictions about the 200,000 jobs that were going to be created almost immediately by this NAFTA agreement, there was an assumption by both the Bush and the Clinton Administrations. This had been started during the Bush administration and then was finished by the Clinton administration. Both administrations made their predictions based on the fact that they anticipated we would have a trade surplus with Mexico for at least 15 years. Immediately, the year after NAFTA passed, we went into a trade deficit with Mexico.

The shift from a small surplus of \$1.7 billion back in 1993 to a deficit of \$16 billion in 1996 in trade with Mexico really has to be explained by the devaluation of the Mexican peso. And, as the gentleman said just moments ago, and I think he did a great job of explaining it, NAFTA was responsible for that devaluation.

Then what occurred in this country, and I do have a copy of the study from Cornell University that the gentleman talked about, it is called a Final Report, the Effects of Plant Closing or Threat of Plant Closing on the Right of Workers to Organize. He is absolutely right, 62 percent of the employers in this country, 62 percent of them said "We will close our plant rather than to negotiate a contract with you" or "If you want to form a union, we are closing our plant. We can now go to Mexico."

That happened all across this country, if we read this report, which the

proponents of extending fast track so that we can expand this horrible agreement without fixing it, they do not want us to read this report.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments, and I apologize to my friend from California. I know he wanted to make a comment about fast track, and I am sorry, I did not realize we were short on time.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for coming out and talking to us this evening about his views on this issue, and we look forward to a hearty debate. And, again, I say to my friend from California, I look forward to participating with him in this as well.

#### LESSONS IN EDUCATION, THE IMPACT OF NEW SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, before I begin with my comments, which are a series and talk about where we are going in education, I want to yield a few minutes to my colleague from California to talk about a project that I have some interest in and I may learn something tonight about, a patent bill that he has proposed and a number of my constituents have called me about.

So I want to yield some time to my colleague from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. There will be a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives next month, probably the middle of next month, that will mean a great deal not only to every Member of the House of Representatives but to every citizen of the United States of America.

As we just listened to our colleagues from the other side of the aisle talking about some of their observations of what has happened with the treaty with Mexico and some of the other economic dealings that we have seen in recent years, it is clear that there is an elite in the U.S. Government and in the United States and in our financial institutions who are not loyal to the interests of the people of the United States.

This lack of loyalty perhaps is due to the fact that they have a vision for a better world. They are trying to create a global economy and, thus, they are willing to sacrifice the interests of the American people. They are willing to sacrifice the standard of living, the freedom and the prosperity, and actually the national security of our country in order to build this more perfect world and a global economy.

I think that this has manifested itself in NAFTA and some of these other things, the GATT. But we will have a vote in one month on H.R. 400, which I call the Steal American Technologies Act. My legislation, H.R. 811 and 812, will be there as a substitute for this horrible piece of legislation that is the

latest example of this elite class who are trying to create a global trading system at the expense of the standard of living of the American people and the rights of the American people.

H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act which is coming to this floor for a vote, is being pushed through the system by an army of lobbyists who have been hired by multinational corporations and huge American corporate interests, who have struck deals with those foreign corporations in order to change, fundamentally change the technological laws, the laws that govern technology in America.

The fact is we have had the strongest patent protection of any country of the world, and that is what has ensured the American people for these last 200 years the ability to have a higher standard of living than other countries of the world, because we were able to out-compete them. We had the technological edge. It was our inventors, the Thomas Edisons, the Cyrus McCormicks, the Wright brothers, all of these people who were protected by the strongest patent system in the world, who stepped forward to give the American people the standard of living and this great chance for opportunity to uplift their way of life and improve the standard of living of their children. But that law is changing.

Our country's national security was based upon our technological superiority, but the laws that governed us, that gave us the creativity and the technology to defeat our adversaries, economically as well as militarily, are trying to be changed and they are doing it in a sneaky way: H.R. 400, which I call the Steal American Technologies Act, which will be voted on in about 3 or 4 weeks.

What it will do is, number one, eliminate once and for all the guaranteed patent term, which has been the right of the American people for 200 years. It will, and hold on to your horses on this if you have not heard about this bill, it will mandate that every American inventor who files for a patent, whether or not that patent has been issued, that his patent application will be published after 18 months for the entire world to see.

This means every economic adversary, every enemy of the United States, everyone who would destroy our country and our way of life almost, have every one of our secrets in order to use our technology against us.

And, finally, H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act, will actually abolish the Patent Office, which again has been part of our country since the founding of our Constitution, and resurrect it as what? As some corporate entity. A corporate entity, I might add, which will be able to accept gifts; gifts from foreign countries, from different people. We do not know what effect that will have on patent examiners, which have been the people who have made the decisions to protect us

and to protect our rights as Americans to own what we create.

This will be one of the most important decisions this Congress will make. Two generations from now Americans will suffer, our security will falter, our way of life and our prosperity will go down and the American people will not know what hit them. It will be a Pearl Harbor in slow motion if this passes.

The only thing that will stop it, the only thing that will stop it is if the American people call their Member of Congress to offset these lobbyists that are hired by the multinational corporations and tell their Member of Congress to oppose H.R. 400, the Steal American Technologies Act, and to support H.R. 811 and 812, which are pieces of legislation that I have authored, Congressman ROHRBACHER, which will strengthen the patent system.

I want to thank my colleague for granting me this time from his time tonight. This is such an important issue for people to understand, that democracy will not work and America will not be strong unless our people get involved.

This whole effort, and I will close with this thought, it is a shocking thought, why are people trying to push something which is so evil and detrimental to the United States? Yes, they believe in a global economy, but part of their motive in reaching this global economy is they are trying to harmonize our law with Japan.

The elements that I just talked about in the law, which is changing in H.R. 400, are nothing more than an agreement that has been reached with Japan, a hushed-up agreement to change our strong patent law into their weak patent law. The harmonization of our law with Japan. It is absolutely an outrage. It is frightening to think it is happening and there are lobbyists all over this city from powerful corporations trying to push it through.

I appreciate the gentleman's giving me this time to warn the people out there who are listening and reading this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We can beat this but we have to act.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for sharing with us and look forward to learning more about this issue over the coming weeks. It is a critical issue.

I have had a number of my constituents calling me and saying get with the Congressman from California, sounds like he has a good thing going and it is something we have to watch out for. So I thank the gentleman for taking that time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to continue a series now that I have been doing for my colleagues that outlines a project which we call lessons in education. This is the fifth in a series. This is the fifth lesson, and it is about new spending and what the impact of new spending is.

The impact is that new spending equals a new tax burden. It is something that sometimes is lost on us here

in Washington. It is lost on my colleagues, that as we come up with an idea for more new programs, more good programs, solving more problems from Washington, that the increased spending, the impact of that is that someone has to pay for it. So lesson 5 is, let us not forget that new spending equals a new tax burden on America's families.

These lessons in education, they are coming out of a process which we call Education at a Crossroads.

□ 2045

Me and my colleagues, especially BUCK MCKEON and FRANK RIGGS, who share subcommittees with me on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, are currently working on this project, Education at a Crossroads, what works and what is wasted. The purpose of our efforts is to do a survey around the country of education, what the results are. There is enough education out there today or there are enough issues out there today that we can say that at least in parts of our country today education is in a crisis.

You go to Washington, DC, right outside of this building, we are spending \$9,000 per student. We get some of the lowest test scores in the country. We have had hearings in California where key people from universities come in and they say, you know what we need to do and what you need to do in Washington is you need to make sure that you continue funding our remedial education programs, and you kind of lean forward and say, these are kids entering higher education in California, what kind of remedial education do they need? And the answer is, well, they cannot read or write at an eighth grade level, so give us more money, and the answer is no, you do not need more money. As experts in education, you have got to get into the high schools, the middle schools and the grade schools and figure out why kids are not learning.

You go around the country and you compare our scores with international scores and we are not getting the kind of results we would like to get. So we know that there are some problems and some opportunities in education. We also then want to take a look at whether Federal programs are helping drive the creativity, the energy, the innovation that we need in education today, or whether Federal programs are a stifling wet blanket of rules and regulations on State and local efforts to move education into the 21st century.

Today I want to just make this additional report. The first lessons that we had is parents care the most about their children's education. That was lesson one. The exciting thing about going to New York, going to California, going to Phoenix, going to Chicago, going to Milwaukee, going around my district, going to Detroit, some of the toughest neighborhoods in the country, and talking about education is that there are lots of places where education is working. And the amazing

thing is where education is working is where parents and teachers and local administrators have gone in and taken their school back, and they have taken their school back at the expense of district administrators, State bureaucrats or Washington bureaucrats.

They have said, this is our school, these are our kids, we know their names, you do not, we are going to run this school the way that we want to run it, the way it needs to be run, because we know what our kids need, we know what our communities like, and we know how to bring the community, parents and teachers, together to service our kids, and we do not want to be locked in by State or Federal bureaucrats.

It is amazing the amount of innovation that takes place when parents and teachers and local administrators are given the freedom to move forward. So that was lesson one, recognizing the fact that people at the local level, parents and teachers, care more about our children and their future than what bureaucrats in Washington do.

Lesson No. 2. Good intentions do not equal good policy. Washington is full of good intentions. We have tried to do so many good things for our children that we have lost focus, that we are here to serve the kids and not smother them.

Over 20 to 25 years, we have developed 760 programs going through 39 different agencies and spending about \$120 billion per year. Lots of intentions, lots of good intentions, poor execution, and actually now, when you take a look at it, poor results at the local level.

Lesson No. 3. More does not always equal better. It is kind of like when you have got a system and the system is not working. Only in Washington do you say, to fix the system, what we need to do is add a few more programs just like the ones that we have had and to fix the system, just put a little bit more money in it. When you put a little bit more money and a few more programs, you know, we think that is going to fix it.

No, what it is time to do is to step back, to take a look at this and to say, more does not always equal better, and more does not equal better when what we are doing today is not working.

Lesson No. 4. Education is not about government or bureaucrats. It is about kids. It is not about tax credits, it is not about Federal mandates. Education is first, last and always; education is always about children. And we have lost sight of that with too many Federal programs. I will go through it a little bit later when we take a look at where education in America has gotten to, at least at the Federal level.

This is done by a cottage industry, a cottage industry that grew up because it recognized that education in Washington had moved away from being for kids; it had moved into becoming a bureaucracy. And what are these binders? Cottage industry, an independent organization that said, hey, there is an op-

portunity out there, nobody knows how to get the Federal money, let us develop a guide to Federal funding for education telling where the dollars are, who to call, how to write your grants, not to write your grants about what is going on in your local school district or the problems that you have but how to write a grant so that the people who give the money out will give you money.

This is a license to steal from the American taxpayer, a license to come to Washington, mining for grants. This is about bureaucracy. This is where Washington has come. Washington has moved to becoming bureaucracy and has moved away from what it really should be, and that is a focus on our kids.

Today's lesson. Today we focus our attention that when we decide to increase spending, that when we increase spending, somebody has to pay for it, so that when we increase spending, we create additional family tax burdens.

Remember that what the President is taking a look at doing over the next 5 years, again good intentions but, remember, good intentions do not necessarily equal good results. More does not equal better. He wants to spend \$50 billion more on education and develop a whole new series of programs. And, remember, if we spend \$50 billion over 5 years, that is \$10 billion a year for education. In the President's eyes, that is a positive move, but remember when the President adds new spending, the end result of adding \$10 billion of new spending is that there are 5 million families that have to send an extra \$2,000 to Washington each year for the next 5 years. What we are doing is we are moving families away from where we want to be, which is a government that can be supported by a one-wage-earner family and where a two-wage-earner family is an option. We are moving with this kind of reckless spending to a situation where a two-wage-earner family is going to be a requirement because one person is going to work to support the family, the other person has to work to support government. That is wrong.

The lesson is, new spending equals new family tax burden. Either we are going to pay for it because we are going to have to raise our taxes, but more likely we will do it the way Congress has done it for the last 29 years and the way this President is proposing that we do it, let us increase spending, let us not increase taxes, let us increase spending and let us pass along this new family tax burden on to our kids.

It is the wrong thing to do.

Take a look at this scenario in one of the programs the President is taking a look at. The President says, we need 1 million new tutors because, why? America's children cannot read.

Well, if we are going to have 1 million tutors to help our children learn to read, take a look at what the cycle here is. Kids cannot read. We have not

taken a look at why kids cannot read, but kids cannot read. The solution is, let us pair a student up with a volunteer. You could say why do we not pair a student up with a parent but, no, let us pair them up with a government-sponsored volunteer which through AmeriCorps may cost about \$27,000, but let us pair them up with a volunteer.

Well, if we are going to have 1 million new volunteers, we are going to have to have a way to manage this. Well, how do you manage 1 million people? Well, what we need is we need a bureaucracy to administer a program to finance and manage our new tutors. So we have got the kids, we have got the tutors, we need the bureaucracy to manage the tutors, to find them, but now you say, how are we going to pay for these tutors, how are we going to pay for the bureaucracy that manages the tutors? Well, we are going to probably have to increase taxes either today or on future generations, on our kids, to pay for the Washington bureaucracy the President needs to administer the program to finance the new tutors.

The tutors, the bureaucracy, the new tax burden. What then happens? We have got a new tax burden. What we are trying to do tonight is we are trying to inform America's families that, hey, you are being informed that you must pay more taxes to pay for the Washington bureaucracy the President needs to administer the program to finance the new tutors. So the family now needs and they are saying, wow, we have to pay more in taxes or we are going to be spending more money.

So what does this now do to the families? They are saying, wow, a tax burden for our kids, or for us. We need more money. Families are forced to send a second wage earner into the work force to take a job, often a low-paying job, just to pay the taxes to pay for the Washington bureaucracy the President needs to administer the program to finance the new tutors.

Now, what is the next step? You have more two-wage-earner families, because more families are forced to send a second wage earner into the work force to take a low-paying job just to pay the taxes to pay to the Washington bureaucracy the President needs to administer the program to finance the new tutors. More parents have less time to spend with their kids to teach them how to read.

Well, we have almost come full circle. Because more families are forced to send more taxes to Washington by creating a second wage earner into the work force to take a low-paying job just to pay the taxes to pay for the Washington bureaucracy President Clinton needs to administer the program to finance the new tutors, more parents have less time to spend with their kids and to teach them how to read.

As we have gone around the country and as experts will tell you, the most effective way to teach a child how to

read is to reinforce the learning at school with a parent at home or person in the family at home reading to the child.

It does not make any sense. We are going to go out and we are going to ask, in this case, to pay for the tutors. It is about \$200 million a year. An average family if they have to pay more taxes, \$2,000; that is either \$2,000 that comes to Washington or it is \$2,000 that stays with the family. One hundred thousand families are going to have to have a second wage earner paying \$2,000 in taxes to fund the tutors.

It does not make any sense to have this kind of scenario in place, to have families having more two-wage-earner families, not by choice but by a requirement because Washington wants to do more for your kids and the only way Washington can do more for our kids is by putting more parents to work so that they spend less time with their kids, which makes it harder for them to learn how to read. Does this make any sense?

No, absolutely not. The time has come to tell the President no new spending. The American people must speak up and be heard on this. More new spending equals new family tax burden. It is time for the American people to stand up and to tell the President, no new spending. There are 760 programs through 39 different agencies spending \$120 billion per year. If we need more education for different priorities, the money is there, and we need to tell the President that.

No, actually we do not need to tell the President that. The President knows that. The President has said that. What we need to do is we need to remind the President of what he told the American people not all that long ago.

□ 2100

A few months ago he was not talking about, the President was not talking about more spending for education. What did the President say on March 27, 1996? He did not say, give me \$50 billion more; let's put 5 million more American families with two wage earners to pay for new taxes or new spending, the new tax burden by this education. He said exactly what we are trying to do with education at a crossroads. So this is not going back and telling the President he does not know. This means going back to the President and saying:

"We agree with you. At least we agree with what you said on March 27, 1996," where he said we cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we have got now.

This was a speech to the National Governors Association, their education summit back in March 1996.

The President knows we have got plenty of money in education. The time is now to say, no more spending; we agree with you, Mr. President. We're not going to ask the American people

to send more money to Washington on education until we take a very good look at what we're doing with the money that they are already sending here on education. Washington spending and taxes are linked. By asking for \$50 billion and more spending, you are asking for \$50 billion in more and new taxes, it's the wrong thing to do. There is plenty of money here in Washington. It's time to stop it, it's time to take a look and do an honest appraisal, an honest assessment of all of these Federal education programs. It's time to take a look at if we've got a bureaucracy like this or a bureaucracy that requires this kind of information to be published to go to the American people to tell them what's available in education funding, we've become too bureaucracy focused and not enough child focused.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to go on for a few more minutes. This is not about who cares about our kids. We all care about our kids. We all care about education. But there is a fundamental difference between President Clinton's approach of spending more money on more bureaucracy and increasing the tax burden on the American people to pay it in our approach. Education at a crossroads says we are going to reassess and clearly identify what is working and what is wasted in these 760 programs, over 39 different agencies, and we are going to focus on getting the money into the classroom.

The disappointing thing that we have today is we walk across the street when we come here to work. We walk across a street called Independence Avenue. In today's world and today's Washington spending, that is now Dependence Avenue. What is done in these buildings has a significant impact on American citizens around the country, whether it is Health and Human Services or whether it is Housing and Urban Development. These people in these buildings have way too much influence on what goes on in America.

We talk about \$50 billion of more money going into this city and into these buildings just for education. What does that mean? It means more decisions, more control in Washington, a bigger Dependence Avenue and less independence and freedom at the local level. Every dollar of taxes that goes to this city comes from an American family and increases the family tax burden.

The first stop of these tax dollars; where is the first? The first stop is when you actually go to work and you earn it, but you do not keep it for very long. As a matter of fact, you do not keep—some of the money you never get. It was a wonderful invention called withholding.

Mr. Speaker, I have got nephews and nieces that just began their first jobs, and they are excited. They have got a job for \$5 - \$5.50 an hour. They work for 20 hours that first week. Pay day is the following Tuesday or the following

Wednesday, and they are excited because they worked for 20 hours at \$5 an hour, and they are going to get a check for a hundred dollars.

Twenty times five is one hundred. This is a good deal. It would be if they got \$100. They get their first check, and they say:

"Well, where did this money go? You know, I've got \$76, and it goes to all these strange acronyms that they have no understanding what they mean." But what we have got is we indoctrinate our children, when they get that first job, it is not really your money. You never see it, it never reaches your checkbook, it never reaches your wallet. It goes somewhere else.

And then what happens?

That check leaves their pocket and goes to this wonderful institution in Washington which is called the IRS, and what happens when it gets to the IRS? The tale of two visions. What happens in Washington when we get your money? One of the best examples is IRS wastes \$4 billion, unsure if it can fix a computer problem.

Think about this, \$4 billion. This is 2 million American families sending \$2,000 to Washington for 1 year, 2 million American families sending \$2,000 to Washington, and they are unsure if they can fix a computer problem. Well, I will tell you there are 2 million American families who could have spent a lot more time with their kids if they had not had to work and send \$2,000 to Washington for this computer glitch.

After investing \$4 billion in taxpayer dollars to try and remedy its inefficient and unreachable computer systems, the IRS has come to one conclusion. It is, unsure, if it can fix the problem. The agency expressed doubt that it was capable of developing modern computer systems, saying it lacked the intellectual capital for the job. It may be lacking the intellectual capital for the job, but the American taxpayers, because the IRS did not realize it could not do the job, 2 million American families had to send \$2,000 to Washington. They had to provide the financial capital, and it all went down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, think about what happens when the money comes here to Washington. Another program; again this one is out of the education programs. Only in Washington a report is completed. The report says drug programs do not work.

OK. Thank you. Thank you for that analysis.

Now, based on that analysis and recognizing that drug programs do not work, what are you going to do about it? What is the Education Department going to do with the billions of dollars that they get every year for drug programs? Only in Washington, when you have a program that does not work, do you say please give me some more money. Only in Washington.

The program does not work, and what happens? We are going to spend more money on the failed programs.

Only in Washington does that make sense. Only in Washington does it make sense when something does not work to pour more money into it and ask more families to have a second wage earner to fund Washington government that does not work.

One final example out of our tale of two visions document. This is a monthly newsletter that we published. The State Department charging people with passport questions. IRS cannot run a computer system; the Education Department cannot run a drug program; the State Department has taken an entrepreneurial approach. They are going to develop customer service.

Think about this. This is your Federal Government that you are paying taxes for. They are going to develop an approach, and they are going to become customer focused. You are paying for this agency with your tax dollars. They are going to become customer centered.

Hallelujah.

But wait a minute. What does it mean when we say the State Department is going to be customer focused? The State Department has created a customer service, not 800 number, to provide you easy access service, but a 900 number for all inquiries regarding passports. This 900 number will cost the public a dollar five per minute to answer questions such as: How many forms of ID do I need to bring? How long does it take to get a passport? The State Department, at least they are consistent. They are also saying we want congressional offices to use the 900 number if they have questions for their constituents. I think that, you know, at least they are being entrepreneurial, but they are forgetting who paid for this in the first place.

The ironic thing would be, can you imagine if this spreads to the IRS, the agency that cannot understand its own regulations and cannot develop a computer system? And when you call it three times and ask three different people the same question, you get three different answers, and you are liable for it. Just would it not be wonderful if they develop a 900 number so that, when you ask the same question three times and get three different answers, you can pay three different times \$1.05 per minute to get the wrong answer.

We also go through and not only highlight what we think is waste in government, but we also highlight real life tales of the opportunity vision, which is people in their communities going out and making a real difference.

There is a school in New York, Our Lady Queen of the Angels, spends \$1,585. Think about it, \$1,585 a year, about one-fourth of what city, State, and Federal governments spend on educating the child. Even by spending a quarter they have shown dramatic improvements in test scores each year, and they are well superior to other schools in their area.

This is not about money getting good results. It is putting in place the right

kind of systems to drive the right kind of behavior that makes things successful.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about government spending. This is what happens to your taxpayer dollars. This is a problem. Let us move on to what happens when those dollars move into the education system.

There is a question about how many Federal programs there are. This exhibit is called the catalog of Federal domestic assistance. If you do not think we help and have a lot of programs in place, in very small type this lists all of the different Federal programs of assistance that we have, and it primarily lists just the names. And when we go to page FI-9 and go through FI-17, we find the section that is called education, 8 pages, and if you add all the programs up here just under this category you will find 660 different programs.

We then went to another organization, Government organization, CRS, and we said, you know, what do you think of this list? Is this an accurate list of government's involvement in education? And they said it is accurate, but as we take a look at it, we identify at least 116 other programs, and we know of no better source than the catalog of Federal assistance, so, you know, we are really not sure, but you are going to the right sources. You have asked us; we have identified at least 116 others, and this identifies 660, so yeah, you are somewhere in the neighborhood of 7 to 800 different education programs.

We talked about earlier this is the cottage industry that has grown up, and what is in one of these binders?

□ 2115

What is in these binders are a description of the different programs, how to apply, program purposes, what is the flow of funds, who is eligible, who do you contact, what is the range of awards. The funding opportunity index, which is the sheet at the back of every binder, is this blue sheet. This is a blue sheet, it is kind of a crib sheet. It tells you as you are going through all of these different types of programs, and it gives you a rating system, it tells you how easy or how difficult it is to get money. It not only tells you how to get the money, but it tells you whether it is going to be an easy program. Like if it has one star, approximately one out of eight applications is funded, or fewer. Two stars, approximately one out of five to seven. One out of four, one out of three, one out of two.

So this has become a bureaucratic exercise. remember, this is not one binder, this is two binders. We get the two binders because it is 39 agencies, it is \$120 billion of spending, and it is over 760 programs.

This is a problem. This is \$120 billion of spending where we are not sure we are getting the kind of results. One-half of all adult Americans are func-

tionally illiterate. Fifty-six percent of all college freshman require remedial education. Sixty-four percent of our 12th graders do not read at a proficient level. You would think as we increase the amount of spending that SAT scores would have gone up over the last three decades, right? \$123 billion of spending. Wrong. They have gone down 60 points in the last three decades.

Last week we looked at two ways to approach education. There was the Washington-centered approach, which is this, when we have these kinds of binders sitting on your desk at the local level. What it means is that local administrators are sitting at their desks and they are gaming out how to get Federal money. The other thing that is happening, when they get these programs, you can imagine the binders and the rules and the regulations that come back and fill up the rest of the shelf.

When you get money from Washington, you do not get the money without strings attached. That is why, as we have gone around the country, people have said the problem with Washington money, and they will take the money because there is still a cost-benefit, that the cost of getting the money and administrating the programs is less than what they receive back, but it is not that big of a deal. What they tell us is, all over the place they tell us, we get 10 percent of our money from Washington, we get 50 percent of our rules and regulations from Washington.

We know that the system, a Washington dollar from a taxpaying family, through the IRS, through the Education Department, back to the local school district, we are estimating that somewhere in the neighborhood of 60 cents to 70 cents gets back to the child. That means somewhere in the neighborhood of 30 plus is taken up by bureaucrats. That means that the process here in Washington is bureaucratically focused, it is not focused on the children.

This is why I agree with what the President said in 1996. The issue here is not about spending more money. This is what the President said. We cannot ask the American people to spend more on education until we do a better job with the money we have now.

Think about it. Instead of increasing spending on education by increasing that dollar or that \$120 billion to \$130 or \$135 billion per year, we can get that money if we just take a look at how we spend it today and we do a better job. Instead of only letting 70 cents get back to the classroom, let us set a real aggressive objective. Let us get 75 cents back to the classroom. That would get us an extra \$5 billion into the classroom, closer to the children.

I do not think that is enough. One of my colleagues is going to be proposing legislation that says maybe we ought to move to 95 cents; that for every dollar that comes to Washington, the entire process of applying for it, administrating it, and getting it back to the

child and reporting back to Washington, that that entire process can only take 5 cents of the dollar.

We need to design a system where the bureaucracy and the bureaucrats only take 5 cents and the kids and the teachers and the parents and the local classroom get 95 cents. That is the difference between a child-centered approach and a Washington-centered approach.

A Washington-centered approach says, let us celebrate bureaucracy, let us give 30 cents to 40 cents of every dollar to the bureaucracy. A child-centered approach says the kid is the most important, let us get 95 cents to the child, and let us make sure that the bureaucracy does not consume a lot of the money.

As we go through this process, it is important to shrink down that bureaucracy, because we know bureaucrats will be paid and we know the bureaucracy will be funded. But we know, at least in the current system, and this is why the President is right, the current system is not working the way that it should. It is robbing from our kids each and every day. We need to be working with the President on examining and clarifying and improving the current system before we put an overlay of new programs that duplicate the system and do not improve on it.

I do not believe that the President has gone through this process. The President has not proposed sweeping reforms of our education programs, sweeping reforms of how we bring these dollars to the local district. He has not done that yet. He has not completed this work. So before we give him more money on education spending, we have to complete this work, because if we complete this work, I think that there is a high probability that we will be able to fund many of the initiatives that the President believes are essential, that is if we agree in concept that we should be doing that, we will be able to fund many of those programs out of the existing base and not out of new spending, not out of new spending which increases our family tax burden.

This process says, before we do new spending, we have to take a look at the 760 programs. Before we create the million new tutors that we talked about on AmeriCorps, the President is right, we ought to take a look at why the current system is not working. Why do we need new spending on literacy when we already have 14 literacy programs? Why do we need to spend new money here on tutors and put it through an agency? Think about what we are doing here.

We are putting money into an agency, a new agency called the Corporation for National Service, started in the 1993-94 time frame, which when we audited or we tried to audit the books in 1996, we found the books were not auditable. Now, think of what that means. We are putting new spending, we are increasing the spending of an organization that spends \$600 million

per year by 25 percent, and they cannot keep their own books. Think about this. \$600 million of your money and they cannot tell us where the money is going.

The reward in Washington is when we have an agency that does not know where its money is going, it does not know what kind of results it is getting at a local level, what happens? Good job. As a matter of fact, you are doing such a great job, we are going to give you another \$200 million per year. Only in Washington.

We could make a joke about it and say, I am glad our tutors are going to be teaching our kids how to read, because they could not teach them how to do math because the agency back home obviously cannot, or back in Washington obviously cannot do math.

Now, that would be a sad enough state in and of itself, but there are some reasons why the corporation says it cannot audit its books. Some of the organizations that became part of the corporation in 1993 were old agencies that did not have the right accounting records and they had to upgrade those systems, so it was not a corporation starting from scratch. Three or four years later you would think, boy, you would think they would have gotten those problems ironed out. But it gets worse.

The Corporation for National Service in 1993 and 1994 was new spending, which means we had to go to the American families and increase their tax burdens. Remember in 1993 we had the biggest tax increase in American history. We put it into organizations that cannot keep their own books, and part of the Corporation for National Service is AmeriCorps. Part of AmeriCorps matches up kids who go out and do volunteer service, quote unquote volunteer service, we pay them about \$27,000 on average, and part of that cost is a stipend that enables them to get a college tuition grant for about \$4,000 or \$5,000.

Now, you would think that in a new organization that is requiring kids to do service and saying if you do the work, you get a stipend, you get the scholarship, that we would set up a system that would match the kids to the dollars for their college tuition. The auditors come in, and this system started from scratch, no history, it started from scratch, and the auditors come in and they say, guess what? Same old tune. These books are not auditable.

So when we start paying out the scholarships, we will not be able to verify, or at least the auditors are telling us that the systems that the Corporation has in place, that should verify whether the individual has put in the required time, required hours to get the scholarship, we will not know whether that has actually occurred. The system does not have any integrity. When the system does not have integrity, it opens itself up for fraud and abuse.

This is what happens. In 1993, the President asked for significant new spending, significantly increasing the family tax burden, and we put it into agencies that are wasting your money and are making more of America's families have two wage earners rather than one. We are moving toward a government that is making a two-wage-earner family a requirement rather than an option.

That is, I think, why parents and families in America are frustrated. More and more of them are spending less time with their kids, and they are doing it because they need to send more money to Washington, and we come up with these convoluted schemes that say, yes, you are spending less time with your kids, so let us start a new program that gets tutors into your house or with your kids. But we are going to need \$200 million more for that, which means that we are going to have to have more of you work, and so there is going to be more of you that are going to need tutors.

It is a vicious cycle. The problem is, it is a vicious cycle in the wrong direction, and if we went in the other direction and lowered taxes and lowered the tax burden and lowered spending, we could have more families where two wage earners was an option rather than a requirement.

□ 2130

The bottom line on all of this is why do we want a one-wage-earner family rather than a two-wage-earner family? Because it recognizes the fundamental thing in American society: That the most effective way to make a difference in an education, the most effective way to train and educate our children, is to have it at the local level.

This chart, where we equate new spending equals new tax burden, says Government programs with more new spending, more new spending in education, increases the family tax burden, so by having parents work longer, working harder, and sending more money to Washington, only in Washington do we believe that that will increase and improve education in America.

I think the bottom line out of tonight's discussion on education, Mr. Speaker, we have to go back and we have to hold the President accountable for what he said in 1996. Mr. President, please, do not come to Washington, please, do not come to Congress and ask for more money to pump into a system that only gets 70 cents to the classroom. Do not come to Congress with spending that will require 5 million families to pay \$2,000 more in taxes so that you can do your education programs.

Let us work together, let us work together in a bipartisan way to take a look at what we are doing today. This is what you said: "We cannot ask the American people to spend more." You were right, but then why did you ask us and why are you asking us to spend

\$55 billion more? You said yourself, "we cannot ask the American people to spend more on education."

You are absolutely right, Mr. President, until we do a better job with the money we have now. You hit the nail on the head, we are not very good custodians of the \$120 billion we are already spending on education. We can do a much better job. We need to find out what is working in education. We need to find out what is wasted in education. We need to identify the models that are working. We need to get rid of what is wasted and build on what is working, and when we do that, it is not an issue of more spending, it is an issue of being more effective.

When we do that, we will get to a surplus budget earlier, we will get to a point where we are not going to ask more American families to put another person to work, or for a person in an American family to work longer hours, to work overtime, so they can fund Washington bureaucracy. There is a better way to do this. You were right in March of 1996. If you would say this and repeat it in March 1997, you have a Congress that is willing and already working on this process, and willing to share the results with you.

This can be done. Our vision for our budget, our vision is to have a one-wage-earner family being able to support and fund this Government. We do not want any more spending. We want to get to a surplus budget as soon as we can, and we want to continue having a surplus so we can continue paying down the \$5 trillion debt that we have built up for our kids.

It is simple: A one wage-earner family, a two- wage-earner family is an option. The budget for 1998 is a matter of choices. It is a choice between lessening the family tax burden or increasing Washington spending. It is about making those choices. It is about restraining spending. It is about saying no to new spending, and it is about doing a better job with the money we have now.

This President is asking for over \$265 billion in new spending authority for the next 5 years. I really think that when we take a look at the \$8 trillion we are going to spend over the next 5 years, that the Congress and the President can find savings of that \$265 billion to fund some of those new priorities, those that we agree with. We can find \$265 billion. We have just highlighted plenty of examples of where there is waste and abuse.

We do not need 760 programs. We do not need education coordinated through 39 different agencies. We do not need to be spending \$130 billion instead of \$120 billion. We do not need to be creating entrepreneurial opportunities and cottage industries. I love entrepreneurs in America, but this is not productive work, telling them how to get more money out of Washington.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1122, THE PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-32) on the resolution (H. Res. 100) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1122) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 91, PROVIDING AMOUNTS FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 105TH CONGRESS

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-33) on the resolution (H. Res. 101) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 91) providing amounts for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 105th Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. SAWYER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. WEXLER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes each day, today and on March 20.  
Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. CHAMBLISS, for 5 minutes, on March 20.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CLAY, to revise and extend his remarks after Mr. GOODLING, during consideration of H.R. 1, in the Committee of Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TOWNS.  
Mr. HAMILTON.  
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
Mr. NADLER.  
Mr. PALLONE.  
Mr. GORDON.  
Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.  
Mr. MCGOVERN.  
Mr. RUSH.  
Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
Mr. LIPINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COBLE.  
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
Mr. CRANE.  
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.  
Mr. GOODLING.  
Mr. CASTLE.  
Mr. EWING.  
Mr. OXLEY.  
Mr. KOLBE.  
Mr. BRYANT.  
Mr. BATEMAN.  
Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.  
Mr. SHAW.  
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOEKSTRA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RIGGS.  
Mr. DELAY.  
Mr. WELLER.  
Mr. PALLONE.  
Mr. HOUGHTON.  
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
Mr. ENGEL.  
Mr. FAZIO of California.  
Mr. LOFGREN.  
Mr. GREEN.  
Mr. RUSH.  
Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
Mr. SHAW.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to express the sense of the Congress concerning the application by the Attorney General for the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate allegations of illegal fundraising in the 1996 Presidential election campaign; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 924. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to give further assurance to the right of victims to attend and observe the trials of those accused of the crime.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.