

they do not have the budget for it. Again, that is another area where there are significant cuts that are being proposed, and the President is talking about trying to come up with some innovations.

Ms. DELAURO. Yesterday when I went to visit the school I was in three kindergarten classes. You just see these little bits of kids, it was just astounding; there they are, in terms of the equipment, and they have these computers in front of them, and they are there with their earphones or their listening program, where they are listening to the story in order to prepare them to move on.

But these kids with the computers, it is just really mind-boggling. There they are with the mouse going back and forth, and several of them were showing people how they were learning the alphabet, and they had the letter D, and then they were using the computer to point to a deer or a duck, and so forth, or using a C and pointing to a cake and so forth.

Here they are, again, these little bits of kids, getting proficient in a technology which is our future, but it is their future more than it is ours. Why are we trying to be in the business of taking away these tools from them?

One program that I wanted to mention was something called School-to-Work. The heart and soul is being cut out of the School-to-Work Program. This is a program that says to young people who are seniors in high school, who do not want to, cannot afford to, or maybe do not have the skills to go on to a 4-year liberal arts college, and God knows, we probably have enough history and English majors to last us a lifetime, but these young people want to go on from school to work. They want to be gainfully employed, they want to get some skills.

This program has allowed that bridge from school to work, really, the first piece of legislation that in so many years has recognized the aspirations of these young people, and their dreams of moving from school to work, without having a 4-year college education. That is truly the fate of most of our young people in this country. The largest percentage do not go on to a 4-year college.

But this program is going to be cut and decimated, and we just say one more time to these young people, "Sorry, you really do not make any difference. Do it on your own." Why are we not in the business of trying to provide a bridge from school to work; again, responsibility? "We will give you some tools so you can carry out what you need to make your way."

We cannot do it for you. That is not what anybody is saying here, nor should we. We do not have the resources to do that. But how do we enable young people to move ahead? This is a program that works, it is gaining all kinds of endorsements from the academic communities, from the business community, because they are seeing the fruits of the labor here, because they are getting these kids who are

well-trained, who have the skills, who can make it in their jobs. Now we are saying, "Sorry, we are just going to close the door on this effort." It is wrongheaded. It really is wrongheaded.

Mr. PALLONE. You talked about programs that work. Just the last one that I wanted to mention, of course, even earlier is the Head Start Program, preschool Head Start Program, because from 1992 to 1995, which is, of course, the span of the current administration, we have had an increase of 130,000 children that were able to participate in the Head Start Program over the last 3 years, because we were expanding a very successful program, which is enjoying—it really had support under President Bush, President Reagan, as well as President Clinton and President Carter. It has always been very bipartisan. Now all of a sudden this Republican leadership budget would deny Head Start benefits to 180,000 children over the next few years. So again, we are talking about misplaced priorities here.

When I go out of my district, when I am in the State of New Jersey and I talk to people, they all tell me that education is paramount. Everyone understands that. I really for the life of me do not understand why the Republican leadership in this House does not get it. Education is crucial. If we are going to start talking about cutting education 20 percent here over the next fiscal year, it just makes no sense. It is totally out of sync with what the American people want.

Ms. DELAURO. Just in terms of translating that 20 percent, and I think you have made the excellent point that there is a minuscule amount of Federal aid in education—sometimes people do not realize that or understand that—from this minuscule amount of money, we are looking at, roughly, if things continue the way they are with this, at this level, we are looking at about a \$3.1 billion cut from those funds. We are looking overall, in terms of the college loan programs, you know, at almost \$5 billion over the next few years in terms of cutbacks in college loans, to say nothing of what is going on in the Pell Grant Program. In the Pell Grant Program, what they did, the bill eliminates assistance to students who qualify for grants of less than \$600; about 250,000 students in this Nation are going to be eliminated from the program.

Perkins loans. Again, these are not great amounts of money that are being put in play at the moment, but the removing of that kind of money has an unbelievable effect on how many young people can look to a brighter future.

I think you would agree with me that we are at a crossroads. We truly are at a crossroads, because we have never seen the level of cuts in education that we are seeing today. Education has always been the way for people to expand their horizons, move forward, and have a brighter future. That has been true with succeeding generations.

This is the first time in the history of this country that if you talk to

American families, working families, that today they do not see a bright future for their kids. They do not believe that their kids will have the same kinds of advantages that they had. That is a sad commentary on what our values are in this Nation and what our priorities are.

So that there is a full-scale assault, whether it is on Head Start and you are looking at preschool programs, readiness; whether it is in a school lunch program that they would like to away with; whether it is in a summer jobs program that is being cut out so kids can make some money, go back to school, and then, again, demonstrate some responsibility; whether it is in education, skills training, and school-to-work, or whether it is in moving kids forward in terms of higher education.

I do not understand it. I think it is outrageous. My hope will be in the next 2 weeks, as we discuss what is going to happen before March 15, that when it comes to the issue of education, that we are not about the business of doing harm, and doing harm for the special interests of this Nation, but that we are in the business of doing what people sent us here to do. That is to do something for the public good and particularly for the kids and for the future of the youngsters in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for joining with me this evening. I am sure that we will be engaged in this conversation over the next few weeks.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

---

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1823

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore. (Mr. MCINNIS) at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.

INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION  
VITAL TO RESPOND TO TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are now in our second week following the recess, a recess where every Member had an opportunity to consult with his constituents, and I think that most of the Members had the same kind of experience that I had. That was an experience of talking with constituents who displayed in their commonsense reasoning far greater wisdom than is often displayed here in this institution.

This body seems to have lost touch with common sense. Common sense of the people says clearly that education is a No. 1 priority. They have been telling us this in many ways for the last 5 years. For the last 5 years, education as a spending priority has ranked in the top five priorities as designated by the American people in public opinion polls. They clearly have shown that education is very important.

Seventy-two percent of the people recently interviewed said that if there are going to be cuts made in the Federal Government, then the cuts should not be in education. Education should not be one of the areas where you streamline or downsize. They clearly stated that this was not desirable.

We have common sense repeating over and over again what ought to be clear to everybody that is in a decisionmaking position in Government. We have a crisis.

We have a situation that ought to be clear by now, where technological change is escalating. Technological change, the telecommunications revolution, the information age revolution are all upon us. As they take hold, it is quite clear that we need more and more educated people. It is quite clear that the people who are educated now need to have an upgrading and different changes in their education.

In order to meet the present upheaval, in order to be able to deal with it, the minimum need is a massive education and job training program. Common sense tells us we need a massive education and job training program. Without any further research, that is quite clear.

Nobody knows where this technological information is going, this age of information, the age of telecommunications. Nobody can really predict where it is going to go and what we should do. Nobody can lay out a detailed plan as to exactly where we are going to be able to take hold of the sit-

uation and not have it wreck our economy.

It is a revolution that is displacing large numbers of workers. We have seen large numbers of blue collar workers displaced over the last 20 years, but now we have the middle-management workers, clerical workers. Large numbers of them are being displaced, certainly temporarily dislocated, and there is no solution in sight to this.

Large amounts of money are being made in a booming economy. The economy is booming if we look at it in general. These are very prosperous times. So if in very prosperous times we are losing large numbers of jobs and there is a great deal of dislocation and upheaval in the job market, then what is going to happen if we fall into a recession and the boom is no longer there? We have a boom which is unprecedented, in that profits are higher than ever on Wall Street, and yet at the same time people are less secure than ever before. More jobs are being lost than ever before.

I would certainly call to the attention of all the Members of this House an article which is must reading. It is a series of articles that started in the Sunday New York Times, March 3 New York Times. It is called, "On the Battlefields of Business, Millions of Casualties." That is the title for this particular article which is the beginning of the series: "On The Battlefields of Business, Millions of Casualties."

This is a series which is called "The Downsizing of America" and this is the first of 7 articles. It is must reading for all Americans, must reading for decisionmakers in Washington, and must reading for Members of the House, because it talks about mostly middle-class people, mostly people who were employed as of 2 or 3 years ago in very good jobs, and the kind of suffering they are going through and have gone through as a result of this technological escalation, the age of computers and telecommunications displacing large numbers of people.

It has not yet moved to the point where they are offering remedies, but I think previous editorials in the New York Times and a few other of our leading newspapers have quite clearly come down on the side of more education. Nobody understands all that has to be done, as I said before, but everybody who is thinking about the problem clearly understands that there will have to be a greater amount of investment in education, a greater amount of investment in job training. It is self-evident. If the experts cannot see what is self-evident, then certainly the common sense of the American people has repeatedly reinforced and underlined the fact that it is self-evident to them that we need a greater investment in education and a greater investment in job training.

National security now must be defined not in terms of our military strength and not in terms of our economic prowess, but the things that sup-

port that military strength, economic prowess, leadership in the world. Underneath it is an educated populace. Nothing is more important than an educated populace. Nothing is more important for the security of the country.

□ 1830

Nothing is more important to the quality of life in the country. Nothing is more important in terms of maintaining our central humanity than a massive investment in education.

Instead of a massive investment in education which is going forward, this present Congress is proposing that we disinvest, that we deescalate, that we downsize the commitment in education. Part of that disinvestment argument is that the Federal Government should get out of the business of education.

We have had the Republican majority propose that the Education Department be totally dismantled, that we get rid of the Department of Education. They put zero in one of the budgets for the Department of Education.

You know, no sane industrialized nation walks away from its commitment to education to that extent. Every industrialized nation, on the other hand, really has a far greater commitment to education at the central government level. There is not a single industrialized nation that does not have a substantial commitment to education, and it is reflected in some kind of single government coordinating body at the top, whether they basically are highly centralized, as they are in Japan and Germany, France, or whether they are moving away from a centralized model and having more flexibility and greater innovation at the local level, as they are in Great Britain, and they still have very strong centralized departments of education to give some kind of guidance and direction.

In this country, traditionally we have had a strong central department of education. I am certainly not advocating that we have one now. I am not advocating that we go to the other extreme, that we have zero, nothing, because our involvement at the central government level in education is minimal. At its very height, when the Department of Education was even funded at a higher level than it is funded at now, we had a very minimal commitment to education at the central level, and the operation of education in this Nation remains in the hands of local education agencies and local school boards. It still does.

Our commitment to education at this point at the Federal level is less than 8 percent of the total amount spent on education, 8 percent of the total. You know, more than \$360 billion was spent on education last year, and of that \$360 billion, most of it was spent by State governments and local governments.