



U.S. Congressman
Nick Rahall
WORKING FOR WEST VIRGINIANS

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**CONTACT: STEPHEN SPINA****THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1989****PHONE: (202) 225-3452****RAHALL OFFERS MISSING PIECES TO EDUCATION SUMMIT PUZZLE**

WASHINGTON, D.C.-- Congressman Nick J. Rahall, II (D-WV), a member of the House Education and Labor Committee today called for President Bush to include educators in his upcoming Education Summit. "All the pieces of the puzzle are not there," said Rahall. "In order for us as a nation to address the needs of education, we must include not only the President and state leaders, but also the Congress, business and labor, and above all, educators. This is the only way to get a clear, crisp, and complete picture of education in America."

Rahall is working, along with other Members of Congress, to make certain the Congress has its fair say in the summit. The Congressman has already forwarded West Virginia Governor Gaston Caperton and President Bush his ten point plan contained in a twenty page report for improving education.

Strong evidence exists to suggest that American businesses are footing a \$210 billion education bill because of remedial and retraining they have had to establish for employees who have already graduated from the nation's education system. "This is a bill America should have already paid," said Rahall.

"I think business would rather hire employees trained to read and add, rather than having to retrain them. Certainly, educating people in the classroom is far cheaper than retraining them in the workforce. We are wasting a lot of money, resources, and time in this nation, all of which our competitors worldwide are taking full advantage. If we could invest only half of this \$210 billion into a modern system of education, we would stand heads above those threatening our economy. I believe this is the starting point for the upcoming summit," Rahall said.

The Congressman's plan includes the following recommendations:

- establishment of technical education opportunities for non-college bound youths while they are still in High School.
- more funding and implementation of programs that teach technical skills while students are still in High School.
- a mix of corporate, federal, state and local education funds to improve productivity.
- the Tech-Prep Program, a four year program combining the last two years of high school with an additional two years at the community

--MORE--

college level, that would provide technical training with a mixture of applied academics.

-- more funding by the Federal Government providing the equipment to train students in mastering modern technology. Rahall sponsored a bill (H.R. 7) that would have done just that-- it authorized \$100 million, with a 50/50 urban/rural split, and it is designed so that the funds flow only to economically distressed local school districts. This bill has passed in the House and is waiting to be voted on in the Senate.

-- increased funding for the existing statewide dropout program.

-- drug abuse education.

-- drug Free School Zones which would give school officials more rights in dealing with drug pushers caught near schools.

-- recruitment of talented teachers by increasing wages and benefits.

-- monies for early childhood education and nutrition education.

"Only through the cooperation of the private and public sectors will we find the delicate balance to fund these measures. All this examination can only do so much. There is no use digging up the tree to check the roots, especially if you don't intend to feed it." Rahall said.

Copies of the Congressman's report may be obtained from his office.

--30--

POSITION PAPER
HONORABLE NICK J. RAHALL, II (D-WV)
MEMBER, HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Presented to Honorable Gaston Caperton, Governor
State of West Virginia
On the Occasion of President George Bush's Education Summit, 1989
Charlottesville, Virginia

FOREMOST EDUCATION CHALLENGES IN THE NEXT DECADE AND BEYOND:

EMPLOYER-BASED TRAINING:

Improving the job-related education and training system in this country is of primary importance, and especially for those youths who do not intend, or believe they do not have the resources available to them to pursue a 4-year higher education degree. They hope only to complete high school with adequate preparation and skills to find entry level jobs so as to become productive, contributing tax-paying citizens, with pride in their ability to earn a living wage.

Congressional findings show that by the year 2000 an estimated 15 million manufacturing jobs will require more advanced technical skills, an equal number of service jobs will become obsolete, and more than 50 percent of jobs that are currently developing will require skills greater than those currently provided by existing educational programs.

The Education and Labor Committee has found that a combination of nontraditional school-to-work technical education programs, using state-of-the-art equipment and appropriate technologies, will reduce the dropout rate for high school students in the U.S. and produce youths who are mature, responsible and motivated to build good lives for themselves. This will regain the U.S.'s former competitive edge within the rest of our global economy.

We must implement and fund existing technical preparation and education programs, described in the following series, to address the rapid technological advances and global economic competition which demand increased levels of skilled technical education preparation and readiness on the part of youths entering the workforce.

We must establish, for the nontraditional, non-college-bound youths a systematic technical education opportunity, by forging links between secondary schools and community colleges -- as an example -- in order to provide youths with skills not only in occupational and practical arts, but in the liberal arts and in basic academics, integrated into a coherent whole, as an intense technical preparation course of study necessary for finding a position in an ever-changing workplace.

As stated elsewhere in this position paper, employers in the United

States spend \$210 billion -- billion -- dollars a year for formal and informal training, remediation, and in lost productivity as a result of receiving untrained youths seeking entry level jobs. We must form partnerships to funnel those corporate funds into education BEFORE students graduate with limited employment skills, not AFTER the fact. This will give a boost to education funding that won't come out of either State or Federal coffers.

THE FEDERAL ROLE:

The Federal role in education is fairly limited. Our job is to look out into our districts, our states, and across the nation to identify unmet needs having national significance, and to then determine what we can do about them; the second step is to find enough money to give to states and localities to address those significant, but unfunded needs of our society.

THE EMPLOYERS ROLE:

There are millions of educationally and economically disadvantaged school-age children and youth in America today. In those states where the warm winds of economic recovery and stability have not yet arrived, such as West Virginia (having next to the lowest per capita income rate in the country, ranking 49th in the Nation just below Mississippi), and where young people who are even now being successfully enticed back into their high school classrooms still have nothing to look forward to after they graduate except for perhaps working in fast food restaurants for less than minimum wage.

Research indicates that we as a nation do not yet know "how much employer-based education and training is enough," but suggests that current commitments are insufficient. I am not certain that I agree with the findings just stated, because the spending of \$210 billion a year on employer retraining and remediation, which often includes the teaching of reading and writing skills, seems to be enough for an auspicious beginning if it is properly channelled. how successfully can we tap that corporate America funding source, for its use before students graduate with little or no skills or preparation, rather than after the fact?

The limited Federal contribution to education, representing only between 6 and 7 percent of the total national spending (states and localities this year are spending approximately \$360 billion on education at all levels), is about \$23.9 billion this year (estimated), which is barely a tenth of the \$210 billion spent by corporate America to retrain and re-educate those same students/youths who are graduating and entering the work force. For some reason, we are not getting what we pay for from Federal, State and local resources for education, and specifically not from business/industry and labor.

2 Properly channeled, the mix of corporate, federal, state and local education and training funds could improve productivity, at reduced costs to consumers by making every dollar spent a dollar well-spent. The result would be to turn out youths who are immediately ready upon hiring to perform entry

level jobs, and more, prepared and trained to move from entry level to mid and upper management.

To do this, one approach would be to assure that accountability between schools and employers come about by presenting the irrefutable demands of the marketplace as a two-way street. Our schools can deliver if the nation's employers become full, paying partners in American Education. How? By urging and making it possible for business/industry to communicate new knowledge and changing skill requirements as they accumulate in the workplace; by embedding schooling in the career development process by placing more weight on educational attainment and achievement in hiring decisions; and by working with educators to develop and provide "learning and earning" curriculums that combine academic and applied learning experiences. (Partial Source: The Learning Enterprise" report issued jointly by the American Society for Training and Development and the U.S. Department of Labor; 1989).

THE EDUCATORS' ROLE:

Employers depend upon educators to provide job-ready and training-ready entry-level employees. They turn to education for most of the training they "buy" from outside sources -- mainly from our secondary schools and community colleges. Educators, too, need to change some of their entrenched strategies by: working with employers to strengthen the link between learning in school and on the job; hire better-prepared teachers, pay them what they are worth, and measure learning outcomes; link the teaching of academics to real-world applications (applied academics); teach students as future employees, particularly students on a general or vocational track in school (whether we like it or not, tracking does occur), how to make decisions, to solve problems, to learn, to think a job through from start to finish, and how to work with others to get a job done.

While West Virginia has a higher-than-the-national average in numbers of students actually graduating from high schools in the latest surveys available, the numbers of those graduates going on to a 2 or 4-year college are below the national norm. Graduating seniors who have no intention, desire or the resources to enable them to go on to postsecondary schools, need our special attention.

3 The United States is very competitive in the realm of educational preparation of white collar and technical elites, but less good, critically so, at providing basic education and occupational training to non-college bound youth. They need, and modestly Congress has provided, a new curriculum that mixes solid academic basics and applied learning opportunities for high school students.

Following are examples of existing laws which will, if funded and implemented, with the President's backing and the support of the National Governor's Association, and business-labor representatives, begin to produce the mature, ready-for-work youths that our state, local and national employers need and must have, between now and the year 2000:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

This past year, the Education and Labor Committee has reported, and the House has passed, its reauthorization of the 89 year-old Vocational Education Act, renaming it the **Applied Technology Education Act**.

Comprehensive rewriting of the Act was achieved by the Committee, doing away with unsuccessful "set asides" for at-risk, targeted populations such as the handicapped, the economically and educationally disadvantaged, and other minority groups including women and displaced homemakers, and replacing them with a poverty-based formula, still targeting those at-risk groups but in such manner as to assure the state/local ability to establish and conduct programs of more comprehensive and coherent quality, scope and effectiveness for those young people intended to benefit. **The formula is geared to drive monies into the economically distressed areas of the nation.**

The major thrust of the new Act, the President should know, is to rebuild and reaffirm the importance of vocational education on local high school campuses which, over the past decade or more, have nearly disappeared. The new Vocational Education Act will require as a means of receiving vocational education funds - the total integration of both academics and occupational skills training. This means that the academic instructor at the high school will be required to interact with the vocational education instructor to assure that while reading is being taught, reading and understanding is the outcome, for purposes of applied technology being taught at the vocational level.

We need "intern or apprentice" types programs, both for vocational students and their teachers, supplied by local employer-partners in education. Governors could begin to urge this coordinated effort between schools and local business/industry concerns. **South Carolina has an excellent program that does this successfully.**

The reauthorized Vocational Education Act requires, in order to receive funding from the Federal government, the integration, number one, of academics and vocational education in the same curriculum offerings, and those must be offered in a program of coherence so that the student receives a sufficient number of such courses to form a "whole."

TECH-PREP EDUCATION ACT:

4 The new Applied Technology Education Act provides for a two-plus-two, or **Tech-Prep Education program** that begins a four year program for youths in the 11th grade (junior year of high school) and continues throughout a two year community college associate degree program. This program must guarantee training in workplace technology that leads to job placement, based on local labor market needs. **The Tech-Prep Education Act is perhaps one of the most exciting, yet fundamental approaches to assuring our high school youths are ready for the workplace that the Congress has enacted in many years.**

The two years in which each student in a tech-prep program is enrolled at the community college level, is a period of intense technical preparation

in at least one field of engineering technology, applied science, or mechanical, industrial, or practical art or trade, provides competence in mathematics, science and communications, (including the use of applied academics), and leads to placement in employment.

The Tech-Prep Program is authorized to be funded at \$200 million. Programs leading to the associate degree are required to match federal dollars in increasing increments until they become self-financing over a five-year period.

FUNDING:

The funding for this program was deferred for one year; **President Bush is urged to request funding for it in his FY 1991 budget request to Congress, in the full, first-year amount of \$200 million.** This is vital, and I reiterate if we are to address the rapid technological advances and global economic competition which demand increased levels of skilled technical education preparation and readiness on the part of youths entering the workforce, we must dust off that tired cliché that education is not an expense, but an investment in our future.

very important
I sponsored a bill that was made part of the vocational education act reauthorization bill (H.R. 7) as passed by the House and is pending before the Senate), **a program responding to the need for funding facilities and the acquisition of equipment in the secondary level of vocational education.** It is authorized at \$100 million, with a 50/50 urban/rural split, and is **designed so that the funds flow only to economically distressed local school districts.** In order for the new era of vocational education to begin and succeed, ~~vocational education programs must have equipment on which to train students in a manner that is up to date and relevant to today's workplace.~~ Not only is there a critical need for modern equipment geared to today's technologies for students, but renovation or modernization of facilities is ~~critical in many depressed areas.~~ **This is particularly true in the Appalachian States whose total dependence on the coal industry is no longer viable.**

The Federal acknowledgement of the need for up-to-date modern equipment, as authorized in the vocational education reauthorization bill, is specifically aimed at leveraging the donation of such equipment by local employers to schools, and for local employers to set up on-the-job internships or apprenticeships in order for students to train in the work place using on-site equipment, the operation of which would be required if the student were hired after graduation.

FUNDING:

Again, funding at \$100 million was deferred in FY 1990 for this new program, and the President is urged to include a request for full funding of this program in FY 1991 in his budget request to Congress.

BUSINESS-LABOR-EDUCATION PARTNERSHIPS:

Also under the newly reauthorized Vocational Education Act, I, along with Reps. Goodling (the Republican ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee), and Rep. Nita Lowey of New York, introduced a bill which was incorporated into the House-passed bill, to provide for partnerships among schools, businesses, and labor. Our bill's main thrust was to infuse resources into schools for the purpose of improving the quality of applied technology education and the desire to fulfill the needs of business and labor for skilled employees. Because the costs associated with acquiring equipment, upgrading facilities, training and retraining teachers, and teaching students and employees places a tremendous burden on the educational communities, I believe that this program should help bring existing resources from business and labor organizations into an educational setting.

FUNDING:

The Business-Labor-Education Partnership program was authorized at only \$20 million, and again funding for it was deferred for one year by statute. It is imperative that the President include a funding request in his FY 1991 budget next year for these partnerships.

The President knows, and the Governor's of all the States know as well, that the United States is a crisis-oriented nation, well-known to be able to react or respond in times of crisis.

As a Federal legislator, and one who is a Member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I can speak to and for the crisis that exists nationwide in the preparation and training of our high school students, and their failure to meet even the least of technological readiness tests for today's workplaces. It will get worse over the next 10 years -- and if we wait until the year 2000 to act, it will truly be too late for a whole generation of citizens of this country who want, need and deserve the right to a public education, free and equal, that allows them to become self-respecting wage earners, serving their communities and raising the next generation of children.

DROPOUT PREVENTION/REENTRY:

5 While West Virginia has an unusual and seemingly effective dropout prevention program under its law (now being considered as a Federal dropout prevention model, tying it to withholding of Federal Highway Funds), one that takes away a youngster's driver's license if he or she drops out of school, there remains a critical need to fund existing Federal dropout prevention programs. Even with the success of WV's program, statistics show that one-half of those brought back to their schools in order to retain their driver's license have since dropped out again (I assume having reached the age of compulsory attendance).

Congressional statistics show that between 750,000 and 1 million students a year drop out of school, with inadequate preparation to enter the

workforce, many others are functionally illiterate. The U.S. loses \$240 billion in earnings and taxes, and employers in the U.S. pay an estimated \$210 billion annually for formal and informal training, remediation, and in lost productivity as a result of untrained and unprepared youth joining or trying to join the workforce of the U.S. These statistics are well-established and relied upon as factual, and the Governors must impress upon the President, and corporate America, that in order for us to be competitive in the future, we are going to need informed, intelligent people who can respond.

When jobs are being redefined every 7 years, we have not even dreamed what 20 percent of the corporations of the future will look like. What we do know, statistically, is that 70 percent of the workforce of the future, the next 20 years, are already working today, and that 80 percent of the new entrants into the work force in the next 20 years will be women or black and Hispanic people.

A dropout prevention demonstration program contained in last year's Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Act was a small program, minimally funded, intended to last only until the larger statewide dropout program could be funded. The small demonstration program recently expired, yet the statewide program has yet to be funded.

FUNDING: It is imperative that the President include in his FY 1991 budget request full funding for the statewide dropout prevention program.

ANTI-DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION, TREATMENT AND PREVENTION:

6 The President and the Congress have agreed that a "war" on drugs must be fought, and I applaud the President's willingness to implement the laws that were introduced and passed into law by Congress last year under our Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse Act. I am concerned, as is everyone, with the problem of finding sufficient funds for this war, but I am confident that we will bite whatever bullet is necessary to do so.

As you know, Congress had already authorized \$6 billion to implement last year's anti-drug abuse programs; the President added \$2.2 billion. The problem with his having done that, as has been stated: (1) the funding isn't sufficient; and (2) the budget resolution ceiling, worked out between the White House and Congress, had already been set -- there was no room for more anti-drug abuse money if we were to remain committed to other social and human resource programs that people rely on back home. We are biting the bullet as it is to avoid sequestration; we are duly concerned about funding the drug war at the expense of, say, education. (Senate leadership Members are meeting to determine whether and how to find additional funds for drug wars without an across-the-board cut as proposed by Senator Byrd). The President has said, "no new taxes," and as with any budget, whether it is personal or public, if no new money is being generated, then new initiatives, no matter their worth, are just not that "doable."

As you may know, if the President's proposal to fight drug wars is implemented as proposed, WV will lose \$4.4 million in EDA funds alone, as

workforce, many others are functionally illiterate. The U.S. loses \$240 billion in earnings and taxes, and employers in the U.S. pay an estimated \$210 billion annually for formal and informal training, remediation, and in lost productivity as a result of untrained and unprepared youth joining or trying to join the workforce of the U.S. These statistics are well-established and relied upon as factual, and the Governors must impress upon the President, and corporate America, that in order for us to be competitive in the future, we are going to need informed, intelligent people who can respond.

When jobs are being redefined every 7 years, we have not even dreamed what 20 percent of the corporations of the future will look like. What we do know, statistically, is that 70 percent of the workforce of the future, the next 20 years, are already working today, and that 80 percent of the new entrants into the work force in the next 20 years will be women or black and Hispanic people.

A dropout prevention demonstration program contained in last year's Hawkins-Stafford School Improvement Act was a small program, minimally funded, intended to last only until the larger statewide dropout program could be funded. The small demonstration program recently expired, yet the statewide program has yet to be funded.

FUNDING: It is imperative that the President include in his FY 1991 budget request full funding for the statewide dropout prevention program.

ANTI-DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION, TREATMENT AND PREVENTION:

The President and the Congress have agreed that a "war" on drugs must be fought, and I applaud the President's willingness to implement the laws that were introduced and passed into law by Congress last year under our Omnibus Anti-Drug Abuse Act. I am concerned, as is everyone, with the problem of finding sufficient funds for this war, but I am confident that we will bite whatever bullet is necessary to do so.

As you know, Congress had already authorized \$6 billion to implement last year's anti-drug abuse programs; the President added \$2.2 billion. The problem with his having done that, as has been stated: (1) the funding isn't sufficient; and (2) the budget resolution ceiling, worked out between the White House and Congress, had already been set - there was no room for more anti-drug abuse money if we were to remain committed to other social and human resource programs that people rely on back home. We are biting the bullet as it is to avoid sequestration; we are duly concerned about funding the drug war at the expense of, say, education. (Senate leadership Members are meeting to determine whether and how to find additional funds for drug wars without an across-the-board cut as proposed by Senator Byrd). The President has said, "no new taxes," and as with any budget, whether it is personal or public, if no new money is being generated, then new initiatives, no matter their worth, are just not that "doable."

As you may know, if the President's proposal to fight drug wars is implemented as proposed, WV will lose \$4.4 million in EDA funds alone, as

his plan proposes to terminate EDA and use its \$194 million for drug war purposes. As the House Champion of reauthorization and continued funding for EDA I intend to vigorously oppose termination of EDA funding as a Member of the authorizing committee (Public Works and Transportation).

STATE RESPONSIBILITIES:

I call to your attention the President's recommendations for States to take certain actions and to pass certain laws giving school and **other officials** more authority to deal with actual drug users and dealers on or near school property.

It is my hope that the bill introduced by State Rep Dale Manuel requiring a minimum two-year prison sentence for anyone over 21 selling drugs within 1,000 feet of a school is enacted into law. This theory should be fleshed-out during the Summit, and a public announcement made of Governors' intent in this regard to pass such laws in all states.

DRUG FREE SCHOOL ZONES:

7 We must be able to give our students, parents, teachers, and communities tangible, visible evidence of the nature and strength of our commitment to rid them of drug dealers, pushers and users. If Governors will commit to passing laws and/or local ordinances necessary to give appropriate authority to officials to deal quickly and lawfully with such criminals who invade schools and school zones, as suggested above, then I believe the Federal government should assist states -- every state -- with start-up assistance to establish and maintain visible DRUG FREE SCHOOL ZONES and all that it implies, including the Warning Signs, in all of its 16,000 school districts.

A lot of money? Perhaps some -- but it could be done either of two ways: (1) Permit/authorize states to use part of their Drug Free Schools and Communities money for this purpose; or (2) Introduce Federal legislation to provide start-up funds for this purpose to be matched by state and local governments, but encouraging business/industry, labor unions, others to provide matching dollars as well. Let it be a Federal-State-Local effort in every way.

I am willing and able to introduce such legislation in the Congress for the above purpose, provided States will provide the other legal incentives and authorities to deal with those we intend to drive out of our schools and out of our school zones.

8 *Against* PARENTAL CHOICE IN SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

It is imperative that the parental school choice initiative being pushed by the Administration be nipped in the bud. School choice should remain a state prerogative, not become a Federal one.

While there is a great deal of merit to giving parents that choice, the limited Federal assistance available to specific groups and segments of school-age child populations should not be targeted for use in making

choice possible. Most of past Administration proposals have been to take, for example, Chapter 1 compensatory education funds (Chapter 1 is currently funded at nearly \$5 billion per fiscal year, and is one of the most successful, popular and essential programs that the Federal government sponsors), and instead of sending these funds directly to the local schools for their use in improving the potential of economically and educationally disadvantaged children, would instead give each and every parent of such children a "voucher" (with a face value of less than \$600), with which to "go shopping" around for a school of choice.

I and a majority of Members of the Education and Labor Committee are adamantly opposed to such voucherization of federal education funds. There are many reasons to be against such tactics, many of them constitutional in that the use of funds for those purposes would probably lead to numerous, and expensive, court challenges (particularly if parents "shopped" for private schools that do not or would not comply with civil rights statutes with regard to admissions.

EXISTING PROGRAMS OF SCHOOL CHOICE:

I will not go into detail here, but while the Administration holds up as examples the few states which have so-called "school choice" programs, one of which has withstood a Supreme Court test (Minnesota), as a reason for the federal government to sponsor choice, none of the programs are up and running on a statewide basis to the extent that they can withstand evaluation and replication at this time.

Further, I strongly believe that states should, as Minnesota has done, implement their own "school choice" programs, and that Governors should advise the President during the Summit that (1) it's a states' rights issue, and (2) federal choice would bring about more, not less, federal intervention in what is and should remain a state/local responsibility and function.

ADMINISTRATIVE CHAOS OF SCHOOL CHOICE:

Governors may want to consider the administrative chaos of what happens when a parent, who pays taxes toward per pupil expenditures in one county, decides to "choose" a school in the next county. How does the money follow the child? Does the next county or school district charge tuition? If a voucher is given to a parent, using chapter 1's \$5 billion per annum as the pot of money to pay for such vouchers, the face value would be less than \$600 per parent per year. That won't pay tuition, nor come close to the per pupil expenditures in most states (in any state, for that matter). If a parent "chooses" a school in another locality, be it in the next county or the next school district, how would schools deal with providing transportation of that (or those) students outside their regular community school zone? These are just a few examples of administrative complexities attendant upon so-called "school choice," particularly from a Federal standpoint.

"CREAMING":

Finally, I oppose choice because it will "cream" the best students from various schools and communities, and leave less-able students behind in a school that will be labeled as "poor and ineffective." That defeats the Federal purpose in creating effective schools programs by challenging all students and teachers to have high expectations and a "can-do" attitude towards their schools and the academic outcomes of those schools.

I do not believe, based on available research on giving parents and students a "choice" in which schools to attend, is as potent a strategy for improving quality of education as it is touted as being. I refer you, your fellow Governors, and the President to a recent study titled "SCHOOL CHOICE: The New Improved Sorting Machine." This study, released in May 1989, concludes that the burden of proof now clearly rests on the advocates of public school choice to show that it can lead to significant equitable school improvement in more than a few isolated cases, and that its risks can be eliminated on a widespread basis as a matter of actual practice and not merely on paper. Let the "best and the brightest" of our students remain in their local schools as a beacon of encouragement and example for at-risk students so that both the school and the students are counted as "effective."

OTHER ISSUES:

FLEXIBILITY: I understand that the Heritage Foundation has suggested, strongly, that the President "deregulate" Federal education programs, and that Governors of the States are urging the President to do this, in the name of flexibility in spending those funds sent by the Federal government, using Executive Order privileges of the President to achieve the goal.

I must say this is genuinely alarming, since Federal programs are legislated in such manner as to be child specific so that they will meet constitutional challenges that precludes our giving "general aid" to education. Not only must they remain child specific, but there must be the "accountability" that shows how those dollars are being spent (i.e., maintaining the specificity of the intended aid).

Should the Governor's implore the President for "flexibility" or more of their own "discretion" in spending Federal funds as general aid wherever it suits them, the specificity disappears. If that should occur, through executive order by the President, the Congress would simply stop funding federal education programs, and particularly Chapter 1, the largest among them. You will note that even our Chapter 2 Education Block Grant to the States provides for ways in which the funds will be spent, and states are given several options. The block grant aspect is that states can choose to spend its chapter 2 funds on only one aspect, or several -- but the guidelines are firmly in place and parameters have been set for that spending.

As for Federal regulations, a history lesson may be in order. When President Reagan was instrumental in bringing about legislation providing an

Education Block Grant to the states (which, by the way merged more than 40 categorical education programs into one block grant, and then proceeded to cut the funding level by 35 percent), the second hook in the block grant was that it would not come with Federal regulations -- only "nonbinding regulatory guidelines." The result was that states were so unable to implement block grant programs with any degree of accountability (audit trails, etc), they asked for and got federal regulations. Funding for that block grant has eroded over the past two fiscal years due to budgetary restraints and efforts to fund new education initiatives such as the successful Even Start Program.

The second history lesson -- and proof that history repeats itself -- is the fact that when categorical education programs are merged into block grants, they are almost inevitably reauthorized at a later date as categorical programs -- witness the Federal Gifted and Talented education program as an example.

National performance standards are all fine and good, but I tremble at the thought that the Federal government is being invited, or even coerced if the President puts his backing behind the effort, into providing those standards. It is the state and local education officials who know best how to measure educational outcomes and to fill in the gaps wherever they occur, both in regard to teacher training and childrens' achievement levels.

I cannot repeat too often that the Federal role is limited in education. The responsibility for education belongs to the States, and the local education agencies are charged with its smooth functioning. Our limited role is to provide authorities and funding to address national needs that are not and cannot be met by state and local governments due to a lack of funding resources. Also, I view federal funding of education a must, and view it solely as a means to return to the people a portion of their federal income taxes. Call it revenue sharing for education. What else are federal tax dollars supposed to do? Sit in the treasury and grow mold? They are there to keep the government operating, taking care of its responsibilities to the people. Education is one of our greatest responsibilities.

Currently the Federal government's share of education funding rests at 6 or 7 percent. We are seeking, in FY 1990, \$23.9 billion. State and local resources provide approximately \$360 billion to pay for the rest. Our share isn't enough, and frankly I believe the Federal share ought to be at least one-third.

RECRUITMENT OF TALENTED TEACHERS; EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION; NUTRITION:

9 These are worthy goals, which the Congress has already addressed. The talented teacher program this year, for the first time, received \$2 million in funding; early childhood education is in the works, plus there are existing programs such as Even Start, Head Start, etc. And the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Programs feed approximately 24 million children a year through our school lunch and breakfast programs. We need more in the way of nutrition education for students and their parents, and legislation is pending to do that. We are also providing for special homeless childrens' nutrition in pending legislation, and for those in institutions. Summer

Food is being expanded. These programs enjoy broad bipartisan support in Congress and have done for 43 years, since 1946.

Many of the programs you seek to discuss at the Summit are already in law, but they are too modestly funded (some not funded at all as yet). We will be happy to have the President commit to their expansion, provided the money is there for them. But if the States and localities have to pick up the tab for eroding federal funding for these kinds of programs after the President pushes them through the Congress, then we are simply running in circles -- vicious circles. It is one thing to promise, and another to deliver.

Whether this President believes as the former Education Secretary did that throwing money at education doesn't help, I do not know. But I have been around long enough to know that money is critical to education, and I believe most Governors would agree -- and most would agree they need all the help they can get from the Feds. If President Bush intends to try to become the Education President by proposing legislation and pushing it to enactment and then either not funding it at all, or offsetting the costs by raiding existing programs, then education funding is still in trouble. We have just lived through eight years of that kind of educational funding approach.

I hope you and your colleagues will urge the President to help us forge partnerships with business/industry/labor to help them become involved in their local schools, and to find ways in which to give them the incentives to channel much of the \$210 billion they now spend on remedial training and retraining of entry level workers, into the schools for use before students graduate, instead of afterwards.

CONCLUSION: I wish you every success with the President's Education Summit. It is historical in that it is only the third such Presidential summit ever called by a President. We have great expectations here in Congress that the outcomes will provide a blueprint for the states and the national with regard to education.

We have 16,000 school districts in the United States. All have, or are going through what is known as "education reform." These "trees of knowledge" must be given a chance to work, and to grow in effectiveness and efficiency before we begin to "study" them again, or completely reverse the process and go in other confusing directions. Be very careful that we don't kill those trees -- which is what will happen if we keep digging them up to see how the roots are doing.