

schools would be built with local taxes from local areas, and then when the local schools were not able to do that, it became a state issue, and in fact the state was working on that.

Of course, now we have the problem that the state and local municipalities are not able to build the schools fast enough in California, and, yes, it has become a Federal issue.

In fact, the President's proposal that we have before us that he brought to us in January, I am very well aware of, because I have sat with him and discussed the bill that I introduced in this House, H.R. 2695, and many of those initiatives are in his proposal.

Now, many of my colleagues on the other side have said tonight, what? We are not in the school construction business. Well, let me tell you, in particular to the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS), who spoke earlier about national security and our defense, it is of utmost national security that our children be educated.

□ 2000

Because of that, the Federal Government must become involved when there is a gap and when we need to fix a problem.

Secondly, we are in the school construction business. In fact, last year, in the Tax Relief Act that was signed in August by President Clinton we had the CZAB bonds, the academy bonds that we now use to renovate schools. So we are in the school construction business.

Secondly, I have heard some of my colleagues say this is a local issue, LORETTA. This should not be done. I am reading here in Congress Daily from yesterday, "House Majority Leader ARMEY says, prohibit the President's school construction initiative, because we want the decision to be made at the local level."

The President's initiative does make that a local level issue. Why? Because the local school district needs to stand up and say, we need to build a school; because local taxpayers need to stand up and say, yes, we will tax ourselves in order to build a new school. What happens with this initiative is that we help them to stand up and take responsibility.

Third, people say that this is an administrative nightmare. Let me tell the Members, it is not an administrative nightmare. In fact, I had five superintendents come in from California just about a month ago, talking to me, of course, about school construction, because they know I understand that language. In fact, they came in and they talked about all the initiatives and all the projects that they are getting done under the CZAB bonds.

Let me tell the Members, one said, LORETTA, CZAB is already there. It is on the tax forms. We give the tax incentive there on the form. Secondly, they said, the approval has been so simple. As long as we meet the requirements, we send in one piece of paper to

the Board of Education and we send one piece of paper to the Education Department out here, and we get it approved. They have been working on it.

Fourth, someone said earlier that only the President's friends will get these bonds. That is not true. Of the seven initiatives that are already bond issues going on with the CZAB program in California, let me tell the Members, San Diego Unified School District, building John Adams Elementary School, reconstructing it, that is in the district of the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY). He is a Republican. Glendale Unified School District, Hoover High School. That is in the District of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN). Clovis Unified School District, the district of the gentleman from Fresno, California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

This is for those places where we need to build more schools. I hope the people will really take a look at the President's initiative.

CALLING FOR FULL FUNDING OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the budget negotiators have come to an agreement over the overall funding levels for education, education programs, but they have not yet resolved how that money will be allocated.

I rise here tonight in the 5 minutes allocated to me to urge negotiators, both Republicans and Democrats, to use this as an opportunity to put money into special education, to fully fund or to move toward fully funding the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

As the previous speaker mentioned a couple of minutes ago, this is a Federal mandate that was established in the early seventies. Originally and today, we are required to fund up to 40 percent of the costs of special education.

When I entered this body in 1995, the level of funding was 6 percent, and now it is a little less than 12 percent. This is a tragedy. It is a tragedy because it hits every single school district and school in the United States. It is a tragedy because it hurts families that have children with disabilities and have to live in communities where the cost of this education, which is perfectly legitimate and necessary, is borne for the most part by friends and neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, the folks who are negotiating tonight need to look seriously at allocating every single one of these dollars to fully fund our obligation to fund special education. Doing so would go a long way toward easing the financial burden that we feel in every community across the country.

Fully funding or using these extra dollars to fund special education would

spread the education dollars more equitably across this country. It would give the local school districts and school administrators and parents the right to prioritize spending, not have the folks here in Washington decide who gets these extra Federal dollars.

I represent a rural district, and I hasten to say that it is quite likely under the President's plan that my district will receive little or nothing. But if we were to fulfill this unfunded Federal mandate, every town in my district would get an extra dollar or two to help defray the cost of education.

Mr. Speaker, this is a compromise that can be supported by Republicans and Democrats, by liberals and conservatives, by anybody that has a commitment to fulfilling an obligation that this Congress made over 25 years ago.

Indeed, the true winners in this battle for more education funding will not only be the teachers, will not only be those who believe that we should have better classrooms and more modern schools, but it will also be school administrators, school boards, parents, property taxpayers, and most importantly, the children of this country.

I urge the negotiators in this budget deal that is going to be coming before us tomorrow to look at the issue of special education before we establish new Federal programs, before we establish new Federal bureaucracies, before we decide in Washington what the educational spending priorities should be in school districts around the country.

Let us meet the unfunded obligation of special education. Let us start tomorrow by putting these extra funds into IDEA.

PUT THE DOLLARS IN THE CLASSROOM, NOT BLOCK GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, as the previous speaker indicated, I, too, am advised that the budget negotiators have come to an agreement as to the overall additional funds that are to go into education. I commend them for the initiative that they have expressed in allocating these additional dollars.

I rise here tonight because I am somewhat concerned that in agreeing to the overall dollar allocations to education, and seemingly in agreeing to the 100,000 new teachers that will be placed into our school systems across the country, that in fact what they are talking about is putting these monies into what is known as title VI.

Title VI is a block grant provision that exists in current law, so if we put this extra money presumably for 100,000 new teachers into a block grant provision, there is absolutely no assurance whatsoever that the monies will be utilized for the hiring of additional teachers.