

and I will tell you this as a young mayor of 27 years old, I was told by the Carter administration, that is how far this problem has gone, that, Mr. Mayor, we don't want to do anything that may be embarrassing to Mexico, because we are trying to close a deal on oil.

I would just ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider the fact that someone said we do not want to confront a major corporation with polluting our water because it might embarrass them.

I do not think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would ever stand for their neighborhoods being polluted, and in fact would not support allowing \$200 million of taxpayer funds to be wasted or not put to appropriate use. \$200 million is going to be spent by the taxpayers of the United States to address this problem, and the problem is continuing.

Now, what was the resolution voted against by all but 28 Members of the Democratic Caucus? The resolution said if Mexico does not stop polluting U.S. waters, Congress will take a look at our treaties that relate to Mexico. Can you imagine that being so outrageous, that if the pollution keeps going, we are going to continue to shut it down? That we are just going to ignore it, because we do not want to even look at our treaty obligations?

I do not believe my colleagues who voted against this bill read the bill or understood the bill, and I do not believe that all but 28 Members of the Democratic Caucus believes that they should vote no to clean up the sewage problems and the pollution problems along our border.

□ 1615

I do believe they got wrapped up in this partisan bickering this week that says if a Republican proposes it, let us vote against it. They voted against it, even though it was against the environment.

I would ask every one of them to go back to their constituents and say, citizens, I believe that our treaties with Mexico are more important than the environment; that Washington should continue not to address this issue comprehensively, that Washington should find excuses for Mexico polluting our waters.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this House has worked longer and harder at working with Mexico, at taking care of this problem. But we do not solve problems by ignoring them or walking around them. I have dear colleagues on this side that come from my State that I will continue to work on pollution problems with, but because we got so wrapped up in the partisan bickering, we had votes that were totally contrary to the historical facts, and desecrated our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, put the partisanship away. Let us vote for our children, our environment, and

quit finding excuses to vote no on everything that comes before this floor.

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

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE FEDERAL ROLE IN FUNDING FOR EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I think everybody has heard that great and wonderful quotation about "We are from the Federal Government and we are here to help you."

I don't know how many are old enough to remember the good old days before the Federal Government got into funding the education program that we all have throughout our country. I think, unless I am mistaken, since they got in there and we were taking test scores and things like that, the grades have gone down.

The Federal Government's assistance has been fabulous. They come up and say, we are going to give you 6 percent of all your funding. That is what they have done so far. Six percent is all the Federal Government gives us in funding education at the local level, but they give us 100 percent of the rules and regulations by which we have to operate.

I know at this particular time, back in the 1960s, I kept trying to tell people, do not accept Federal money because it will come with strings, and you will not have the slightest idea what they are going to tell you to do the next day. But they did.

It was not too long ago, I think about 6 or 8 months ago, or maybe when we first came in and got control of Congress, we decided that somebody, somewhere, ought to come up with the idea of preventing unfunded mandates.

Let me give Members an idea of unfunded mandates. Unfunded mandates are what the Federal Government says you have to do if you accept their money. So here we are, accepting 6 percent of the money from the Federal Government, and they come up with new ideas. One of the ones they came up with, and I am not saying that this particular idea was terribly wrong, it is called IDEA. It is the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Basically, what it was is children with disabilities were not getting a proper education, so the Federal Government, being thoughtful and thinking of what was right and what was wrong, decided we are going to mandate to you folks back home in your school system, we are going to man-

date that you take this special education pot and take care of these children.

So they did. They mandated that we do it, and guaranteed, let me just tell the Members, they guaranteed that they would fund up to 40 percent of this total amount of money that was going to be given to run this special education program.

So far, and I have been here in Congress 12 years now, under the Democrats they never raised anything. They got up to 7 percent and that is where they stopped. They never got any higher. They were supposed to come up with 40, and promised us in blood, we will give you 40 percent of the costs, but they never did. They never got up over 7 percent. Really, we took control 4 years ago, and we have increased it to 11 percent. But stop and talk about a mandate, this program is underfunded by \$10 billion.

The President has come along with a great and wonderful idea, 100,000 new teachers. Can Members imagine how they are going to fund these teachers? Why in the world, if they are coming up with all these brilliant ideas, do we not fund programs that we have already brought up?

The fact of unfunded mandates is one of the major things. I was a county commissioner for 8 years. We spent time after time trying to figure out, if we took the Federal money, what were the strings they were going to put on it and make us do? If we wanted money for a sewer but we had to apply for water, we could not use it for whatever is necessary. At one time under President Nixon, they decided to open it up and let them take Federal money and do with it what they thought they really needed, but that is not the way it operates still.

We passed that program several years ago, just a couple years ago, about unfunded mandates. Let me say, they are coming along now and telling us how much they are going to help us with construction of schools. The Federal Government is going to step into this and help get school construction started.

I do not know if Members have ever heard of a thing called the Davis-Bacon Act. The Davis-Bacon Act says if there is a dollar's worth of Federal money in any construction, they must pay what is a little higher than union wages. In an area like mine in the South, and we are a right-to-work State, if we accepted a dollar's worth of Federal money to construct schools in our State, it would cost us 30 percent more.

In other words, if we wanted to build a \$1 million school and we accepted the Federal money, because of the additional labor costs, it would cost us \$1,300,000, a complete loss of \$300,000 worth of local money because we accepted something from the Federal Government.

All of these great and wonderful things about the 100,000 teachers, and helping us with schools, all of this is

going to cost money from somewhere, yet the Democrats and the President have promised, they have guaranteed the elderly, and I happen to be one that collects Social Security, they guaranteed us that they are going to protect Social Security come hell or high water. They are going to take care and make sure that it is untouched. Yet, just in the education programs alone, they have to be spending billions and billions of dollars that we do not have.

So where do they get the money? The money obviously has to come from the surplus. There is, everybody knows, no surplus. It belongs to Social Security, so anything we do is basically Social Security money being used by the Democrats to fund their favorite dream.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GORDON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### PARTISAN DIALOGUE ON EDUCATION NO LONGER HOLDS THE TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware this is a Sunday afternoon. As one of my colleagues noted earlier, we would rather be somewhere other than here. I, for one, would like to be home with my family, and with my children. I would have liked to have been there last night, when he played goalie for his soccer team for 2 games in a row, because the other goalie was out sick or had an obligation. But instead, we are in Washington, D.C. working on the Nation's business.

I noted with interest the President's speech yesterday. The Nation's business at this point is finalizing our budget process and coming to agreement. Yesterday we held a little press conference out on the steps of the Capitol. We called on the President to join us, to join us in resolving our differences in getting the Federal Government funded for the next year and to move on with the Nation's business. Unfortunately, we have not been able to achieve that because there is disagreement.

We should not set aside our principles. We disagree legitimately on the scope and role of the Federal Government. We believe that we need a smaller Federal Government. The other side believes we need a larger Federal Government. We believe we need more local control. The other side believes we should federalize almost all of the issues.

We have reached a point, though, where we must find a common middle ground. The President has decided that

we cannot reach that middle ground because, he says, the Republicans are failing to pass his education initiative.

It really is sad that the dialogue in this country becomes partisan and no longer holds the truth. In this case, the Republican record on education is one that the Nation should be proud of, and one that the President actually, I believe, supports and has supported.

In the 105th Congress, in this Congress, this Congress has sent the President seven different measures which he has enacted and signed into law: The Higher Education Act, the Special Education Fund, the WorkForce Investment Act, the Loan Forgiveness for New Teachers Act, the Quality Teaching Grants Act, The Emergency Student Loans Act, and The Prohibition on Federal Tests Act.

We also have seven additional bills waiting for the President's signature: school nutrition, charter schools, quality Head Start, vocational education, Community Service Block Grants, \$500 million plus for special education, and the Reading Excellence Act. This is a record of which every single American should be proud, a record of the Congress doing its job to fund education.

Yet, I was saddened to hear in the President's radio address yesterday this issue made partisan. The President, it seems, wants his ideas imposed on education. What does he want specifically? Number one, he wants national testing. Number two, he wants new teachers, 100,000 new teachers, but he does not want them hired under Title I, the existing Federal program that funds the hiring of teachers.

He wants them in a new program, the Bill Clinton new teachers program, and he wants 5,000 new classrooms. He wants those in the Bill Clinton New Federal Teacher Construction Classroom Act, so that he can have his name on it. That is what this issue is about.

Yet, let us look at the record, because the record is one in which Republicans have an excellent record on education, and in which the history of education is actually quite sad for the Federal Government in total and for the Democrat Congress in particular.

Let me talk specifically about the issue of special education. We all understand special education. We understand the IDEA Act. We have talked about it. I recall very distinctly standing on this floor last year and fighting for more funds for IDEA, for funding for children with special education needs.

Let us talk about why I was fighting for that, where this Congress stands and where this country is, and why what the President says he wants is not what this Congress did under Democrat leadership, and is not what this Congress is even doing now when we are trying to get funds into special education.

Let me make this very clear. Current Federal law, passed under a Democrat Congress, says that 40 percent of the cost of educating, that is, the increased

cost of educating a special education child, a child with special needs, 40 percent of that cost is supposed to be borne by the Federal Government. The remaining 60 percent is supposed to be picked up by the State and local governments; 40 percent Federal, 60 percent State and local.

That is what the law says, in theory, passed by the Democrat Congress and Congresses before the 104th Congress. But what is the reality? The reality is that when the Republicans took control of this Congress, only 6 percent was being funded by the Federal Government. Now we have moved that up to 12 percent, but we are falling millions of dollars short. This list shows how many millions. We are falling short in Los Angeles Unified District by \$60 million every single year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, if we will fund IDEA, the districts can take care of their own education needs without passing the President's Federalization initiative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. LOFGREN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GREEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DICKS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CONGRESS ACHIEVES LITTLE, WHILE EDUCATION NEEDS IN AMERICA ARE GREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let me just make one comment, to start off with. First of all, let me just thank my colleagues who are here this late afternoon on a Sunday. There has been a lot said on the other side of the aisle about wanting to be home with family, and