is obvious they have not done a good enough job.

In 1998, the last year they tried to audit the books, the books were still not auditable. Perhaps in this one account we can find a good portion of that, but then we still cannot take away what is in this report. Paying for Jerry Springer, paying for a process that takes 20 weeks and 216 steps.

Mr. SCHAFFER. There really are two points upon which we need to focus in order to accomplish the job of truly making the Department of Education an efficient and lean organization for the benefit of children. One is the financial structure of the Department, which is cumbersome and it is boring to a lot of people. It is not exciting. But that is where a lot of the money is.

But the second, which the gentleman has focused on, are the policy-related decisions.

□ 2030

There are many functions of the Department of Education that we frankly do not need that, as I commented Friday when we came back here, there are good, hard-working, conscientious folks that are working in some of the offices that we visited. But frankly, there are a handful of offices and programs that the Department maintains and runs today that, despite the best of efforts, they are not essential.

I hate to say that to some of the folks that are employed by these programs. They work hard at the task that has been given them. But if we ask an average teacher around the country, those who teach my children and those who are in schools anywhere in America, whether some of these programs that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) mentioned just a few moments ago are important when stacked up against the classroom level needs that these teachers have in their classroom, I think nine times out of ten a teacher, certainly a principal and an administrator, is going to pick the money to the classroom rather than the money to the Government program in Washington.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, that puts us right back to what the Republican agenda has been and like we said when we began this. The two parameters are, number one, their books are not auditable, so we are going to be able to find the waste, fraud, or the savings in the Department. I am not concerned about that.

But then that moves over into the policy debate. And remember, Republicans have put more money into education than what this President even asked for. So it is not about money. What it is about is policy, how is that money going to get to a local school, how is it going to get to a local teacher or to a local classroom.

My colleague and I just participated in, number one, we said last year and we are going to work on it again this year is that we want to put 95 cents of every Federal education dollar into a local classroom so that a teacher can use that money to help educate a child.

The second thing that we want to do, and this is where we really had the two different worlds of education policy two weeks ago, the ESEA, the Elementary Secondary Education Act, which is a Washington mandate model that says you will use this money to do these types of things and we are going to measure you and hold you accountable, versus the process that you and I very much support, which is what is called Straight A's, which is, in exchange for the States coming back and getting a great degree of flexibility, we will hold them accountable, not for what the other bill does, which is measures process, did you fill the forms out correctly and did you use the money for what we intended it for, we allow the States and allow the local school districts to take the money and use it on what they felt was most needed in that school, if it was technology, if it was reducing class size, if it was teacher training, if it was additional materials for the classroom; and in exchange for that flexibility, the State would be held accountable not for filling out the process, but for improving the educational achievement of every student in the State.

So the Federal Government would reach into a contract with the States and focus on academic achievement rather than a process oriented system.

That is what this is all about. It is about educating kids. That is why we are going over to the Department of Education and saying, we are sorry, a department that manages $120 billion a year that does not have auditable books is not doing a good enough job helping our kids get a good education, a department that perhaps maintains some of these questionable accounting practices really is not doing a good enough job.

We have not even talked about the duplicate payments.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, no, we have not talked much about that either.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, this is I think maybe perhaps one of the sadder moments when we were sitting down with the leadership of the Department of Education and we asked about duplicate payments and they said, we are aware of one. And we kind of pushed them on it and they said, well, there might have been a couple. And then we hauled out again from I think their chief function officer document that we said the head of the bullet points were examples of duplicate payments, 40 million, 4 million, 296.

I know that went to the State of Colorado or the University of Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, they sent it back.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Yes, they sent it back. But these were examples and they were only telling us about a couple. So, again, this is another thing that we have asked for is, give us a listing of all the duplicate payments that were made under this old accounting system and did you recover them.

Because maybe some schools maybe did not know they got a duplicate payment and so they maybe spent it, and now all of a sudden they have got to be put on a repayment schedule to get the money back.

Sloppy fiscal management is not in the best interest of anybody. It is not in the best interest of the taxpayer. It is not in the best interest of the Department of Education. And it is not in the best interest of local school districts, either.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, to go back to one of the remarkable quotes that my colleague referenced a little earlier, I do not want to name the Member in particular, but one of our colleagues blasted our visit to the Department of Education. He said in the quote, and this is an AP story, he blasted our efforts as ''storm trooper tactics'' of the three Republicans who visited Friday on the Department of Education.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) for participating in the special order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. BERKLEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. STUPAK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family matters.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and November 2 on account of official business.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and November 2 on account of business in the District.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family medical matter.

Mr. OWENS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. HAYWORTH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. HULSHOF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and November 2 on account of attending the birth of Casey Elizabeth Hulshof.

Mr. TOOMEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending Pennsylvania state elections.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.