WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. Henry R. Marockle, State Superintendent of Schools
Building 6/1900 Kanawha Blvd. E./Charleston, West Virginia 25305-0330

Phone: 304-558-2681
Fax: 304-558-0048

To: Suzanne Bailey
Liaison, Senator Robert C. Byrd

From: Barbara Jones Barbara
Executive Assistant to the State Superintendent of Schools

Re: Goals 2000 Legislation

Date: September 15, 1995

Thank you for your assistance regarding the Educate America Act. Our concerns about the demise of this legislation include:

1) Establishes **high academic standards in the core curriculum** areas of history, geography, civics and government, English, mathematics, foreign language, the arts and science;

2) Establishes **high expectations for the performance of students and teachers**;

3) Provides **strong support that we need for the exclusion of guns from schools**--currently, we have appealed a judgement in a lawsuit in Greenbrier County where a high school student brought a **.357 Magnum** to school, was expelled by the superintendent, and ordered returned to school by a local judge;

4) Unlike other federal programs that are targeted for specific populations, this program **provides for the improvement of school programs for all students;**

5) Unlike other federal programs which are so restrictive that local school districts spend their time and resources in court attempting to justify their actions on the behalf of students, this **legislation has no such regulations--only procedures to ensure fiscal responsibility.**

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Dr. Henry R. Marockie, State Superintendent of Schools
Building 6/1900 Kanawha Blvd. E./Charleston, West Virginia 25305-0330

Phone: 304-558-2681
Fax: 304-558-0048

September 6, 1995

The Honorable Robert C. Byrd
United States Senator
SH-311 Hart Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510-4801

Dear Senator Byrd:

Thank you for the opportunity to share with you my views on the proposed federal budget cuts to education. Yours has been the voice of reason throughout this Congress as proposal after proposal to change the role of the federal government has been advanced. While I believe that every responsible citizen supports the effort by the United States Congress to address the budget deficit that has grown so dramatically since 1980, the concern is how to responsibly resolve the crisis.

My concerns are twofold:

1. A massive reduction in education funding will weaken the nation's capacity to maintain its position in the world during the coming years;
2. The proposed block grant will violate our state constitution by directing funds to the office of the Governor, rather than to the constitutionally responsible agency, i.e. the West Virginia Board of Education.

It is reasonable to expect that education, in tandem with every other area of government, will share in an equitable fashion the reduction in spending that is critical to eliminating the budget deficit. However, the proposed budget reductions, as passed by the House of Representatives, are neither reasonable nor equitable. Just as the 1995 budget rescission targeted education far more than any other program, the 1996 budget seems to be a repeat performance. It has been reported that education, while representing only two percent of the total federal budget, will suffer twenty percent of the budget cuts.

While the elimination of the deficit is one goal of the federal government, it is not its only goal or its only responsibility. Let me suggest that the best way to achieve deficit reduction is to create a highly skilled workforce. American students of every age must have the opportunity to develop the skills and the knowledge necessary for a high wage economy. We believe, if we are to maintain our position of primacy in the world, economically, militarily, technologically or ideologically, we must make a strong and continuing commitment to make available to every citizen of the United States (without regard to economic, age, sex, ethnic, racial, or geographic status) an education that will enable him/her to provide adequately for his/her family. A generation ago, one wage earner could provide a middle class lifestyle for a family. Today, it often takes two wage earners to provide even a modest lifestyle for a family. If we do not improve our ability to be successful wage earners, an ability that is improved through continuing access to a quality education, the prognosis for the United States as a nation is dire indeed.

In reviewing the Report of the Committee on Appropriations, I found that I was particularly troubled by the following decisions of the House:

Goals 2000: Educate America Act

The elimination of this legislation is especially troubling because it clearly articulated for the first time a set of goals for education in the entire United States; and, it established a new and powerful relationship between the federal and state education agencies, a partnership that recognized the specific roles that each brought to the table and instituted reform as a "bottom-up" initiative.

This program has been successful in bringing all members of the community together to work toward school improvement. Although the dollars are limited ($761,000 for the first year of funding), they are having an enormous impact in resolving the particular problems identified by the citizens of the community. Forty-three of the fifty-five school districts in West Virginia are implementing programs that were designed by local citizens-- parents, students, teachers, business and community representatives--to address areas of concern that were identified as priorities by that community. Finally, let me applaud the Department of Education for not imposing regulations to implement this program.

School to Work Opportunities Act

The loss of $95,000,000 nationally in School to Work Opportunities Act will cost the state some $94,000 next year. It will mean that one thousand West Virginians will not have the benefit of this program. While the House Committee doubts the efficacy of the legislation and ability of schools to develop successful partnerships with the business community, our experience is that it is possible and essential to do so. Jobs, how to prepare for jobs, how to find and maintain jobs, are the critical elements in developing the independence and the self reliance of the citizenry.

Education of the Disadvantaged (Title I)

The loss of $11.8 million in Title I funds to West Virginia will result in the cessation of services to more than 2,000 of our poorest children. Local school districts cannot assume the burden that will be left. These districts tend to be the most economically disadvantaged in the state. Our citizens pay the fifth highest percentage of their income in the nation in support of their local schools. In most instances, an excess levy of 100% has been imposed. Without Title One funds, programs will disappear and children will not be served.

The rewrite of the Improving Americas's Schools Act (IASA) and the Goals 2000 legislation were the two real accomplishments in education by the last Congress. Through these two pieces of legislation the Congress reconceptualized the relationship between state and federal government. For the first time, the state was empowered to develop a unified plan that enabled local districts to submit one plan for instruction, rather than the ten previously required. Our state plan is being field tested this fall and will be implemented statewide this next school year. We have found our local superintendents to be excited about the potential for more effective planning, as they expect this to result in both improved student performance and district accountability in demonstrating the responsible use of public moneys. More importantly, it returns to the state the flexibility to make decisions, rather than following the dictates of federal regulation.

Let me close by pointing out some apparent inconsistencies in the philosophy that underlies the proposed legislation.

- If the intent of the Congress is to improve the performance of students in the nation's schools, why attack the professional development moneys that provide high quality experiences for teachers of mathematics and science? The Eisenhower Professional Development moneys are the keystone to developing and maintaining adequate skills in these areas. Worse, why continue to ignore the needs of teachers in other core curricula?
- While the House questioned the effectiveness of the Drug Free School Program, let me suggest that the only place in our society that students receive a consistent message that drugs are harmful is through educational programs in the schools. The media and (some) parents are ambivalent at best. The loss to West Virginia of $1.8 million will cripple what is a very effective program. West Virginia continues to have the lowest crime rate in the nation and we believe that educational programs like this one are responsible for that fact.
- Why support the initiation of a charter school program--a program that will create a duplicative system of schools? With a system of waivers at the state and national level already in place, any existing school can recreate itself.
- Why remove scholarship programs that recognize, reward and stimulate merit? What message does it send to our youth if college scholarships are available only to those who meet the criteria of poverty? Or are star athletes? The Byrd scholarships have delivered a powerful message to young people, a message that makes clear that the willingness to work hard and dedicate oneself to achieving high standards is more important than economic status or innate ability.
- Finally, why provide an increase in dollars for S.S.I. for students and families as an incentive to have a child identified as disabled? You questioned the wisdom of this program earlier. Now, the House has recommended an increase in funds--not for achievement, not for merit, but as a reward for having a child inappropriately identified as "learning disabled" or "emotionally disturbed." Can economically disadvantaged parents be blamed for taking advantage of this "benefit"? What is our excuse--what justification can we have in creating and/or expanding this "victim mentality"?

Again, I thank you for this opportunity to share my concerns. As always, the work that you do is very much appreciated. Please contact me at (304) 558-2681 if I may be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

HMarock

Henry Marockie
State Superintendent of Schools

Bond, Missouri
Chafee, Rhode Island
Cochran, Mississippi
Cohen, Maine
Snowe, Maine
Domenici, Neew Mexico
Gorton, Washington
Hatfield, Oregon
Jeffords, Vermont
Kassebaum, Kansas
Roth, Deleware
Shelby, Alabama
Simpson, Wyoming
Specter, Pennsylvania
Stevens, Alaska
Campbell, Colorado
Kassebaum, Kansas
Bennett, Utah
Hatch, Utah

Procter&Gamble

JOHN E. PEPPER
Chairman of the Board and
Chief Executive

September 8, 1995

General Offices
The Procter & Gamble Company
One Procter & Gamble Plaza
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-3315

The Hon. Mark Hatfield
United States Senate
711 Hart Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Hatfield:

I am writing you on a subject to which I have devoted more of my effort over the past decade than any other apart from my family and my work, and that is public education.

Specifically, I am writing to share my strong convictions with you on the importance of the continued funding of Goals 2000. I know you have been a strong long-term supporter of public education. I know that the 1996 U.S. House of Representatives appropriations bill as it now stands would not include funding for this program. I think this would be a tragic mistake.

There are two major things which this legislation does which are absolutely imperative.

The first of these is to establish at the national and state level standards of achievement that our children must meet in order to be competitive with children graduating from schools in other global economies. You and I both know that there is great truth to the saying that you "get what you measure". We are still in the early stages of communicating to the American public and, indeed, to many in the educational community, the importance of meeting high standards and taking accountability for doing so. Failure to continue the Goals 2000 Act/Educate America Act would represent a tremendous setback to this effort.

The second part of this legislation that is so important is the stimulus that it is providing to the states and communities to accelerate their reform efforts. I understand that 48 states have received first year Goals 2000 funds. I have personally reviewed the projects that are being funded in Ohio. Several of them are in Cincinnati. While no one of them will be a magic panacea, they are grass roots efforts that can become breakthrough success models.

Goals 2000 is, of course, only a part of the massive effort that must be placed to achieve the educational improvements our country needs. Most of what needs to be done must be done at the state and, above all, local levels. However, I firmly believe that while this isn't a perfect act, the great majority of the spending and its two key thrusts on establishing measures and supplementing local reform efforts are sound and essential and should be continued. Moreover, cancellation of this effort would be a terribly serious setback to this nation's educational reform effort.

I would be glad to answer any questions you may have. If there are other individuals you think I should communicate my convictions to, I would appreciate your letting me know who they are.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

J. E. PEPPER

CC Mr. J. T. Gorman

THE SENATE

GOP Moderates Refusing To Get in Line

Complaints center on extent of changes proposed in health, social policy

Their views are unfashionable and their numbers have dwindled in recent years, but Republican moderates in the Senate are refusing to lie down as the conservatives controlling the party march forward with their revolution.

In committee, in conferences with the House, and on the floor, the moderates are complaining not about the goal of balancing the budget but about the extent to which their GOP colleagues are unraveling the safety net for the poor and overturning decades of federal social and health policy in one fell swoop.

They warn that, though their numbers may be small, their votes are crucial if Republicans are going to succeed in passing their deficit-reduction measure. "This bill goes too far," said John H. Chafee of Rhode Island during Finance Committee deliberations on the budget package. Other Republicans echoed his concerns.

"I'm very worried that the Republican Party is going a little too fast and a little too far," said Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell of Colorado.

The moderates' stubbornness is producing friction with conservative firebrands in the House and Senate, who argue that moderates are playing into President Clinton's hands, watering down GOP bills so that he can sign them and take the credit.

"There are some senators who don't think there was a November, but the voters are going to hold us accountable," says conservative Rod Grams, R-Minn.

By David S. Cloud

RICHARD ELLIS

Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, who switched to the GOP in March, said recently, "I'm very worried that the Republican Party is going a little too fast and a little too far."

"We should be clear about giving the voters what they asked for."

If conservatives prove too draconian, they could face a tough selling job getting the moderates to vote for the final deficit-reduction package, known as reconciliation. Assuming no Democrats support the measure, Majority Leader Bob Dole, R-Kan., needs almost every one of the Republicans to pass reconciliation. The resignation of Bob Packwood, R-Ore., leaves Dole with 53 GOP votes.

"There is no question but that moderates are a very important voice, far in excess of the modest numbers that we have," said Chafee. "We realize that on some issues we hold the balance of power," added a Republican senator.

Still, with only a half dozen or so members in their camp, the moderates have obvious limits.

Instead of dictating policy, they are often in the position of blocking or toning down legislation sent over from the House. Moderates can push just so far, though, because they have a definite political stake in seeing their party succeed in its quest to pass a balanced-budget plan — a consideration that tempers their willingness to vote against the GOP budget plan.

"It's the mega-package, and obviously that makes it more difficult" to vote against, said Olympia J. Snowe, R-Maine.

At least, that is what the Republican leadership is hoping. "Obviously, the conference [the caucus of all GOP senators] has to be understanding of the moderates' concerns. They remind us of them constantly," said Connie Mack, R-Fla., a junior member of the leadership. "The important thing is that we all recognize that this is too important for us to fail."

No one personifies the cross pressures and divided loyalties more than Chafee, an old-school moderate with a long record of support for federal antipoverty and environmental programs. As governor of Rhode Island during the 1960s, he promised to create a "a state version of the Great Society" — President Lyndon B. Johnson's platform of social programs, many of which are now under the GOP knife.

Chafee is the lone moderate on the Finance Committee, where Republicans enjoy only a one-vote majority. He has voted frequently with Democrats on unsuccessful amendments to the budget package. But as uncomfortable

GOP Moderates Standing Firm

Moderate Senate Republicans, this page, from left: Specter, Snowe, Domenici (bottom) and Chafee. Opposite page, from left, Jeffords, Kassebaum (shown with Democrat Edward M. Kennedy), Hatfield and Cohen.

as Chafee has appeared with much of the GOP agenda, he is close to Dole and unwilling to cast his vote to block the reconciliation bill in committee. Rather, he is laying the groundwork to ameliorate some of the unacceptable elements of reconciliation when the bill reaches the Senate floor.

"The conservatives push, too, so there's nothing wrong with us making a push," Chafee says. In some cases, he says, "What they're doing is not only bad policy, it's bad politics for the Republican Party."

The small group of moderates coordinates strategy in meetings each Wednesday, but the group has become more active lately, gathering twice and three times a week during the welfare debate over July and August. "We discuss our issues, share our views, and that's how our strategy has emerged," says Snowe. "It's been a good way for us to stay together."

Making Their Voices Heard

In ways large and small, the moderates are making their contrary views and their clout apparent.

Seven Republicans sent a letter to Dole on Sept. 22 warning that GOP plans to trim federal spending by giving states responsibility for Medicaid, the government's health insurance program for the poor, may end up hurting single women, children and the impoverished elderly. "It is important that reforms designed primarily to achieve budgetary savings . . . not unintentionally increase the number of uninsured," the letter said.

The letter portends a floor fight over Medicaid when the reconciliation bill reaches the floor. It was signed by Chafee, Campbell, Snowe, William S. Cohen of Maine, James M. Jeffords of Vermont, Nancy Landon Kassebaum of Kansas, and Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon. Although willing to turn the Medicaid program over to the states, the group opposes removing federal guidelines that, they say, protect needy children and the poor.

The conservative social agenda is also driving a wedge through the GOP in Congress. Finance Committee Republicans adopted language that would prevent states from paying for abortions with funds provided through Medicaid block grants. "It was a surprise move," said Snowe, adding that she thought it was an effort by conservatives "to assert themselves on this question." *(Story, p. 2995)*

Snowe, joined by Jeffords, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, Campbell and Cohen, sent a letter to Finance Committee Chairman William V. Roth Jr., R-Del., urging him to leave abortion restrictions out of the bill.

Another flashpoint is the appropriations process, which House members have exploited this year to push through an array of conservative priorities. For example, Jeffords has infuriated House Republicans by blocking their efforts to attach an amendment to the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill imposing sweeping restrictions on lobbying and "political advocacy" by non-profit groups that receive federal grants.

The provision, crafted by Reps. Ernest Jim Istook Jr., R-Okla., and David M. McIntosh, R-Ind., is portrayed by the sponsors as a way to end abuse of taxpayers' money by nonprofit groups, many of which are associated with liberal causes. House Republicans have warned that they will vote down the spending bill unless it contains the provision.

But Jeffords, exercising his ability

to block the provision in the conference committee on the bill, has simply refused to consider it. "This is where the moderates simply have to be heard. When you go as far as they did on that, there's simply no way to support it," he said. *(Story, p. 3001)*

Jeffords has spent his career out of step with his party. In 1981, when he was in the House, he was the only one of 191 Republicans to vote against President Reagan's tax bill. Lately, however, he has been displaying more of a tendency to balance his loyalty to the party against his personal views.

A member of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, Jeffords could not bring himself to vote for $10 billion in cuts and additional fees on student loans approved by Republicans on the committee Sept. 26. The package was assembled by Kassebaum, chairman of the committee and another moderate. *(Story, p. 3008)*

But Jeffords did not want to be responsible for preventing the committee from meeting its savings obligations. Faced with two unappealing choices, Jeffords opted not to show up when the vote was taken, allowing Republicans to approve their cuts on an 8-7 party-line vote.

"It makes no sense" to cut education funding to reduce the deficit, Jeffords said. Still, he decided to skip the vote because, "as a Republican, I'm not going to prevent a chairman doing what they have to do to get the bill out of committee."

Even Kassebaum, who worked feverishly to win the votes from fellow Republicans, predicted her hard-won compromise will not survive when moderates and Democrats get a chance to amend the package on the floor.

No Open War — Yet

The moderates' tendency to water down the party's message has frustrated Senate conservatives, but it has not yet led to open rebellion, something that could change once the reconciliation bill reaches the floor.

So far, Dole has usually bridged the differences within his party, relying on the forbearance of conservatives, many of whom realize that the House functions as a sort of conservative backstop to prevent the Senate from tempering too much.

But moderates say they are prepared to replicate the coalition they demonstrated during the debate over the welfare bill (HR 4), which the Senate passed Sept. 19, should the GOP leadership ignore their calls for changing the reconciliation package.

In laborious negotiations with the leadership and in a series of amendments on the floor, moderates formed a powerful coalition with the Senate's 46 Democrats and succeeded in softening the conservative cast of the welfare bill.

Dole needs a bare majority to pass reconciliation, which may not be filibustered under Senate rules. And while Dole has few votes to spare, it may be easier for him to pick off individual senators and persuade them to vote for the reconciliation, by appealing to their party loyalty.

No moderates are staking out hard positions yet, and most seem to think that their concerns can be accommodated. For example, Snowe says that she and Jeffords intend to try to restore some of the cuts in the student loan program, making up the revenue by targeting corporate tax breaks.

"Ultimately, it does get down to who we are as a party, and we want to make sure that we are viewed as balanced, fair and reasonable," says Snowe. ■

THE BUDGET

Stopgap Bill Allows GOP, Clinton Six More Weeks of Haggling

Pact on continuing resolution averts a government shutdown, but Congress and the White House remain bitterly divided

In their first round of budgetary chicken, both sides blinked.

Worried that voters would blame them all indiscriminately if the government shut down, congressional Republicans and President Clinton agreed to give themselves a six-week extension past the Oct. 1 start of fiscal 1996 to get the new year's spending bills done.

That averted the first, much-anticipated "train wreck" that would have occurred had money run out for most of the federal bureaucracy at midnight Sept. 30.

Instead, a continuing resolution (HJ Res 108) will provide stopgap cash through Nov. 13 for programs funded by appropriations bills that Congress has not yet finished or that are likely to be vetoed as soon as Republicans send them to the White House.

This relatively peaceful resolution to the first of at least two threatened budgetary collisions could be the start of a series of negotiated truces — or it could be the last tranquil moment for a long time.

From here on, the pace will pick up, as Congress and the White House try to resolve deep differences over how far and how fast to go in scaling back government.

The work will proceed on two separate tracks until about mid-November, when the stage is set for an even bigger wreck. By Nov. 15, Congress and the White House could find themselves in the middle of a showdown involving unfinished appropriations bills, the GOP's huge, budget-balancing "reconciliation" bill and an extension of the limit on the national debt. The next six weeks are crucial.

Track One: Appropriations

On one track, GOP appropriators and the White House will try to work

By George Hager

SCOTT J. FERRELL

Livingston beams after announcing agreement Sept. 27 on the stopgap spending bill. Rep. David R. Obey is in the background.

out disagreements over as many as eight of the 13 appropriations bills before the stopgap funding measure expires.

Republicans had vowed to send all 13 bills to Clinton by Oct. 1, but a slow start early in the year and their own ambitions to dramatically remake the federal government combined to put them way behind schedule.

With one day to go before the Oct. 1 deadline, they had sent just two bills to Clinton (military construction and their own legislative branch bill) and failed to clear any more, making a stopgap bill essential to keep the government running.

The House adopted the interim measure (HJ Res 108) Sept. 28 by voice vote, and the Senate cleared it the next day after intense negotiations with the administration in which both sides gave ground.

Republicans agreed — for now — to strip out the controversial legislative language they have added to spending bills for the last several months in their effort to slash federal regulations and wrap rigid new constraints around federal agencies.

And the White House agreed — for now — to live within the Republicans' sharply reduced overall funding levels for appropriated spending (the one-third of the budget that underwrites the military, the federal bureaucracy and most of the government's day-to-day operations).

The stopgap bill will fund programs at the average of the level in the House- and Senate-passed bills, minus an additional 5 percent. But in the case of any program Republicans have proposed to cut deeply, the White House can limit the cut to no more than 10 percent below the 1995 level.

That de facto floor will extend, at least for a little while longer, the life of programs that have been zeroed out in both the House and Senate bills; an example is the president's cherished National Service volunteer initiative, which both the House and Senate have voted to kill. It will also allow agencies targeted for deep cuts, such as the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Labor Relations Board, to continue operating at close to their current levels while the two sides negotiate a spending level for the rest of fiscal 1996.

Negotiators bent over backward to prevent any furloughs of federal employees, even including language allowing increased spending if the cutbacks stipulated under the stopgap bill would force employees out of work.

The administration's ultimate goal is to secure more money for domestic programs. But it now appears the White House can get the money only by scaling back the 1996 defense appropriations bill and transferring some of the proceeds into domestic spending bills that the administration charges have been slashed much too deeply. The administration also has sharp objections to scores of specific spending cuts and the legislative riders in the domestic bills themselves.

GOP appropriators, on the other hand, have been adamant about keeping defense spending as high as they can and keeping it separate from domestic funds, especially in the Senate, where a revived budget "fire wall" prohibits any transfers.

Although the White House has threatened to veto eight bills, appropriators expect that most of their battles will come over just four or five:

- Labor-HHS, with its vast array of social programs. *(Story, p. 3007)*
- Commerce, Justice, State, where Republicans have rewritten some of Clinton's anti-crime initiatives and slashed high-priority Commerce Department technology programs. *(Story, p. 3006)*
- Interior, where the White House and the GOP are at odds over low hard-rock mining fees and cuts in environmental and arts funding. *(Story, p. 2987)*
- VA-HUD, where Republicans have slashed environmental regulations and funding. *(Story, p. 3003)*
- Defense, which the administration sees as, in effect, a potential piggy bank for additions to domestic bills. *(Story, p. 3013)*

Difficult Road Ahead

Republicans have characterized the struggle over appropriations as a fight between the GOP and the White House, but it was GOP defectors who blew up House leaders' plans to finish more spending bills Sept. 29. Numerous House Republicans joined Democrats to reject the interior and defense appropriations conference reports, badly splitting GOP ranks and putting appropriators even further behind in their drive to get the bills to Clinton.

Although passage of the stopgap bill let both sides make conciliatory statements about working together, there were signs that actually coming to agreement over the next six weeks will be very tough. When last-minute White House demands over the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program and United Nations funding threatened to hold up the stopgap bill, House Appropriations Chairman Robert L. Livingston, R-La., exploded in fury.

"They're just pulling issues out of the air!" he complained, insisting that White House negotiators were behaving the same way they did when their lengthy haggling delayed a deal on the big "rescissions" (spending cancellations) bill (HR 1944, PL 104-19) earlier this year. "These people don't know how to bargain and they don't know how to close a deal," he said. "They're incompetent!"

Track Two: Reconciliation

On a separate track, congressional Republicans will be working frantically over the next six weeks to assemble their massive budget-reconciliation bill, so named because it reconciles tax and spending policies with deficit-reduction goals. It is slated to cut $894 billion in spending over the next seven years, enough to balance the budget by 2002 if there is no serious economic slowdown between now and then.

Congress has been slow to assemble the necessary spending cuts. It missed the original Sept. 22 deadline and the extended Sept. 29 deadline as the critical panels — Senate Finance, House Ways and Means, and House Commerce — all repeatedly delayed final action on big cuts in projected spending for Medicare, Medicaid, the earned income tax credit (EITC) and other politically sensitive entitlement programs.

Senate Finance was closest to finishing up but was still working Sept. 29 on its plan to cut back spending in the twin health care entitlements, Medicare and Medicaid. The committee is responsible for the largest single portion of the Senate's reconciliation cuts — $530 billion, or almost 60 percent of the total.

House Ways and Means Chairman Bill Archer, R-Texas, announced late in the week that his committee would put off voting on its Medicare cuts until Oct. 9, well past the extended deadline. The committee had some trouble coming to agreement with the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) over the scoring of its Medicare proposal, which CBO had to verify would cut $270 billion from projected spending over the next seven years. House Commerce was expected to finish its markup of cuts in Medicare (it shares Medicare jurisdiction with Ways and Means) at about the same time.

Most of the other 18 House and Senate committees were hitting or coming close to their spending-cut targets, with the notable exception of House Agriculture. Earlier, both the House and Senate Agriculture panels were having serious trouble meeting their targets, hamstrung by objections from farm-state members who were balking at GOP plans to phase out agriculture subsidies.

But while Senate Agriculture finally met its $13.4 billion spending-cut target Sept. 28, the House panel failed to agree. Chairman Pat Roberts, R-Kan., chose instead to punt the matter to the House Budget Committee, which will work with the House Rules Committee to insert the necessary spending cuts into the reconciliation bill the full House will take up in October.

This will mark the second time this year that the Budget and Rules committees have had to produce cuts that Republicans blocked at the committee level. Last March, when the House was assembling a package of spending cuts to pay for the tax cuts in the GOP's "Contract With America," Republican members of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee blocked adoption of proposed increases in federal workers' contributions to their pension plans. Budget and Rules combined to insert the $11 billion spending cut in floor legislation anyway. *(Weekly Report, p. 927)*

Debt Limit Strategy

Republicans intend to send the finished reconciliation bill to Clinton before Nov. 15, by which time the Treasury Department is expected to start having major difficulties in paying the government's bills unless Congress agrees to raise the limit on federal borrowing.

RECONCILIATION '95

Tick-Tock: The Weeks Ahead

The following is a rough outline of the schedule budget strategists in the House and Senate hope to follow for the next six weeks. The goal — obviously an ambitious one — is to send President Clinton a reconciliation bill by mid-November, while at the same time finishing all 13 of the 1996 appropriations bills. Subject to change on a daily basis, here is how things are expected to happen:

Week of Oct. 2. *Senate:* The Senate Budget Committee expected to receive legislation including all of the Senate Finance Committee's cuts in projected spending for Medicare, Medicaid, the earned income tax credit (EITC) and other entitlements by Monday, Oct. 2. Committee staff would quickly assemble that with spending cuts from other committees and send the package off to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) for scoring.

Under a rule adopted when the Senate approved the budget resolution conference report, Senate Finance cannot proceed to mark up a tax cut until CBO certifies that the reconciliation package would actually balance the budget by 2002. If all goes according to plan, CBO would provide that certification before the end of the week. With the certification in hand, Senate Budget then could release Senate Finance to begin work on up to $245 billion in tax cuts over seven years.

Week of Oct. 9. *Senate:* The Senate Finance Committee is expected to lay out its tax-cut mark on Tuesday, Oct. 10, and proceed to mark up the cuts on Oct. 11 and 12 and possibly the 13th. The Senate Budget Committee expects to have Finance's completed tax-cut legislation by Friday, Oct. 13.

House: The Ways and Means Committee is expected to begin marking up its Medicare cuts on Monday, Oct. 9, the last day of the Columbus Day long weekend, finishing by Wednesday, Oct. 11. If it has not already done so, House Commerce is expected to finish its markup of cuts in Medicare this week as well.

Week of Oct. 16. *Senate:* Senate Budget would report the reconciliation bill on Monday, Oct. 16. The bill would go to the Senate floor on Wednesday, Oct. 18, or Thursday, Oct. 19, and the Senate would work on it (the statutory debate time is 20 hours) until done, probably Saturday, Oct. 21.

House: House leaders were leaning toward having separate floor action and votes, first on the Medicare portion of the reconciliation package and then on the larger package itself. In order to get to conference with the Senate by the middle of the following week, the House would have to complete most or all floor action this week.

Week of Oct. 23. *Senate and House:* The conference between the Senate and the House is expected to begin by Wednesday, Oct. 25. Some Republicans expect that negotiations with the White House could start while the conference is under way.

Week of Oct. 30. Conference continues.

Week of Nov. 6. Conference continues and finishes. The original goal for having the reconciliation conference report passed by the House, cleared by the Senate and sent to President Clinton was Friday, Nov. 10. It now seems more likely that the conference would try to finish its work by then, with floor action following quickly in both chambers. This would allow just 2½ weeks for what could be a very tough conference.

Week of Nov. 13. *Appropriations:* The six-week continuing resolution Congress approved in late September to provide stopgap appropriations funding in fiscal 1996 would expire on Monday, Nov. 13. If congressional Republicans and the Democratic White House had not yet resolved their differences on all 13 of the fiscal 1996 spending bills, they would have to agree to another stopgap spending bill to cover the unfinished bills or risk at least a partial government shutdown beginning Tuesday, Nov. 14.

Reconciliation and debt limit: Meanwhile, Republicans would like to send Clinton a reconciliation bill that includes an extension of the permanent debt limit by Wednesday, Nov. 15, the date the Treasury Department is expected to begin having serious trouble paying the federal government's bills without an increase in the government's borrowing ceiling. If Clinton vetoes the reconciliation bill, as he has warned he will do, he would also reject the debt limit extension, risking the United States' first-ever default on its debt obligations or forcing the Treasury to begin to use controversial methods to keep borrowing, such as "disinvesting" some of the federal government's trust funds.

This could be an extremely difficult week, as three separate budgetary trains — appropriations, reconciliation and debt limit — all converge simultaneously.

—*George Hager*

(Timetable, this page)

GOP strategy is to hold Clinton's feet to the fire by including a debt-limit extension along with the reconciliation bill. Many Republicans have vowed not to extend the debt limit unless Clinton agrees to GOP demands to balance the budget in seven years (Clinton would prefer eight to nine years instead). But Republicans have noticeably toned down their rhetoric on the debt limit, which spooked financial markets over the prospect of the government's first-ever default on its Treasury obligations. *(Weekly Report, p. 2863)*

Sen. Spencer Abraham, R-Mich., and nine other GOP freshman senators threatened Sept. 27 that they would not vote to raise the permanent debt ceiling unless a bill to balance the budget by 2002 had been enacted. But they pointedly did not rule out a temporary debt ceiling extension, which would keep the markets calm while allowing time for budget talks between the White House and Congress. ■

SCHOOLS: HOW NOW AND WHAT NEXT?

School's in for the year. But are the nation's schools good enough for our children—and for the future? Two radically opposed answers to that question have recently surfaced. One comes from Education Secretary Richard W. Riley, a former governor (of South Carolina) who brought with him unblemished credentials in fighting for children's welfare and school reform.

"Steady-as-you-go" on school reform, suggests Riley, who points to the federal government's annual "Condition of Education" report, which shows that compared with a decade ago, American high school students are scoring higher on mathematics and science tests and somewhat fewer are dropping out.

But Louis V. Gerstner Jr., the hard-charging chairman and chief executive officer of International Business Machines Corp. (IBM), sees a different world when he surveys the nation's schools.

Addressing a meeting of the National Governors' Association in midsummer, Gerstner said that American education remains sick and unresponsive, that our schools require "a fundamental, bone-jarring, full-fledged, 100 per cent revolution that discards the old and replaces it with a totally new performance-driven system."

"We're going out to hire people," says IBM chairman Louis V. Gerstner Jr., "and we find they can't even read or write."

For too long, Gerstner said, the business community was blind to the problems in American education because it was undergoing painful downsizing. "But now we're coming out of that," he added. "We're going out to hire people, and we find they can't even read or write."

Riley's more upbeat tone, his warning that "this is no time to retreat from our efforts to keep education a national priority," is understandable enough in the face of $3.8 billion in cuts in education spending that the House has already voted for and in view of a movement in Congress to abolish the Education Department altogether.

Some of the improvements that Riley cites seem very real. Since the "A Nation at Risk" report in 1983, the share of high school students nationwide who are taking such tough courses as algebra, geometry, trigonometry, calculus and advanced science has risen from 13 to 47 per cent.

Gerstner, by contrast, suggests that the nation has deluded itself with the Goals 2000 objectives set by President Bush, then-Gov. Bill Clinton and the nation's other governors at Williamsburg, Va., in 1989. With about 1,600 days remaining until 2000, Gerstner pointed out, who seriously believes that the nation will achieve such goals as a 90 per cent high school graduation rate, or making our students the "best in the world" in math and science?

The reality, Gerstner said, is that "400,000 young people are still dropping out of U.S. schools yearly, 400,000 of our most precious assets in our country"—or, if you multiply that figure by the six years since Goals 2000 has been in place, "2,400,000 Americans doomed to a life of pain and poverty."

Gerstner's solution? To set tough, corporate-like performance measures that would require significant progress toward higher academic achievement—not in 2000, but next year and every year.

"Until we're prepared to penalize students, teachers and administrators for lack of performance," Gerstner told the governors at the meeting, "the system will fail." By talking of Goals 2000, he added, "maybe we left ourselves air cover that was too high."

The IBM chairman told the governors to act like the CEOs of their states, make a personal commitment to higher educational performance and be as rough with obstructionists in the education system as any corporate chieftain would be.

"Measure the progress against your goals, relentlessly and continuously," he said. "*Confront* and *expel* the people and the organizations that are throwing up roadblocks to the changes you consider critical."

But can governors really do that? They exist in a political world, competing with legislatures, fighting to balance budgets, oftentimes confronted with independently elected, sometimes quite powerful, state school administrators.

What governors can do is use their bully pulpits to demand education reform and galvanize the business communities in their states to take up the fight. What Washington can provide is advocacy and tracking—like Riley's recent report.

But maybe the nation has reached a point where "bone-jarring" change has to be delivered locally.

Just ask Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago. He persuaded the Illinois legislature to oust his city's entire school board and give him four years of total command of Chicago's perennially lagging, deficit-plagued public school system.

The Daley management team has moved swiftly to reduce central office staff, to privatize several services and to establish a multiyear balanced budget. A new Office of Accountability and Outcomes will dispatch educational "SWAT" teams with full powers to assess what's wrong in a dysfunctional school and to advance solutions—retrain teachers, reduce class sizes, buy new textbooks, for example—or even close down a school and start from scratch.

Will other cities and troubled suburban districts take Chicago's path? Maybe so. Because they're held responsible for failing schools anyway, mayors are asking, why not take the power and ally themselves with the civic and business forces that are calling for dramatically improved skills in high school graduates? In New York City, Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani is demanding Daley-scale powers. Boston's mayor already appoints the entire school board.

The opponents of change, of course, detect patronage motives in all this. But if we expect mayors to emulate the IBMs of the world, to face down labor unions when they must, to force radical change for improved education, then why shouldn't they appoint their own people to do the job and, if they don't, to replace them with managers who can? ■

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671 | # of pages ▸

To Mike Cohen	From Barbara Jones
Co.	Co. WV Dept Education
Dept.	Phone # 558-2118
Fax # (202) 401-0596	Fax # F. Y. I.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
CHARLESTON 25305

GASTON CAPERTON
GOVERNOR

September 18, 1995

The Honorable Robert Byrd
United States Senate
311 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Byrd:

I am writing to ask for your support for Goals 2000 appropriations currently under consideration by the United States Senate.

In recent years, it has become increasingly apparent that West Virginia's children learn better when their parents and communities become actively involved in their schools. Because of this, I have launched a Community Schools initiative to connect West Virginia schools with their surrounding communities. Last year, Goals 2000 funds became an invaluable part of that campaign, recognizing that the path to achieving national educational goals must begin on the community level.

At my request, Goals 2000 funds have been combined with new Community Schools funds appropriated by the West Virginia Legislature to spur innovative school community initiatives in forty-five schools across the state. This month the eighty-person Education First Advisory Panel, jointly convened last November by Superintendent Marockie and me, will unveil a plan to use future Goals 2000 and Community Schools funds to encourage similar community-based action at every school across the state over the next four years.

Like you, I was initially concerned that Goals 2000 might be another top-down federal program that invaded the State's prerogative to manage its own education programs. As utilized however, flexible Goals 2000 resources are in fact fueling a bottom-up, community-based education reform strategy that is already yielding concrete results for thousands of children in West Virginia.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

Simply put, Goals 2000 funds are proving extremely valuable to West Virginia school children. Please consider supporting the continuation of this important, uniquely flexible federal program.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Gaston Caperton

Gaston Caperton
Governor

GC:dse

- Senate Approps
- Floor vote
- Targets for BA

Bond, Missouri
Chafee, Rhode Island –
Cochran, Mississippi
Cohen, Maine –
Snowe, Maine –
Domenici, Neew Mexico
Gorton, Washington –
Hatfield, Oregon –
Jeffords, Vermont –
Kassebaum, Kansas
Roth, Deleware –
Shelby, Alabama
Simpson, Wyoming
Specter, Pennsylvania –
Stevens, Alaska
Campbell, Colorado
Kassebaum, Kansas
Bennett, Utah
Hatch, Utah

19

Author: Susan Frost at WDCT02
Date: 10/6/95 4:56 PM
Priority: Normal
Receipt Requested
TO: Mike Smith at WDCT01
TO: Mike Cohen at WDCB01
TO: Kay Casstevens at WDCB01
TO: Jennifer Davis at WDCB02
TO: Terry Peterson at WDCB01
TO: Frank Holleman at WDCB01
Subject: ABRAHAM

------------------------------------ Message Contents ------------------------------------

Eddie Moore (Hollings) is very concerned about the votes on this if it ever goes to the floor. (Hollings is the traditional lead opposing private school choice) He's checking Randy on Daschle's staff to make sure they don't agree to this or any other Goals amendment in a time agreement. Groups I called yesterday are now on this (they called Eddie) just in case it raises its head on another vehicle.

Democrats who are on the wrong side of choice: Bradley, Lieberman,Breaux and maybe Byrd, Nunn and Kerrey. He wanted to know if they were BIG Goals supporters ---- I said I didn't think any of these were really good on Goals and Byrd and others may be bad.

ALL other DEMS are okay he thinks. Republicans on the right side of choice include Hatfield, Specter, Jeffords, Chafee, Cohen --- Unknowns are Kassebaum, Snowe, Stevens, Frist, Thompson, Shelby, Burns. I didn't think any of the unknowns were great on Goals either.

He wanted to make sure Secretary would both support Goals AND be solidly against choice --- I said that was easy. We'll talk again next week and see what we need to do..... any ideas? susan

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESS

Over 25 Years of Helping America Work

September 12, 1995

Honorable Arlen Specter
Chairman
Subcommittee on Labor/HHS/Education
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

America's business leaders are strongly committed to the goal of reducing the federal deficit and balancing the budget for the nation's long-term fiscal health. As you make the difficult decisions about spending priorities to reach the goal of a balanced budget, one of the critical investments that business believes must be maintained is the public investment in education and training. These investments are the foundation for America's future economic growth and social strength.

I am writing, in particular, to express support for funding the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, including state education reform grants, the National Education Goals Panel, and the National Skill Standards Board.

The knowledge and skills of employees are the critical factors for economic success and international competitiveness in business. Yet, we continue to find that job seekers are less prepared or less able to compete in the modern workplace. High performance workplaces and increased technology require ever-changing skills. Education and training investments at the federal, state, and local levels are essential to enable both businesses and individuals to develop the skills that can sustain the standard of living that Americans expect.

The federal investment in Goals 2000 is seed money with the unique ability to generate major innovations and to leverage other state and local funds. National leadership has been crucial to the gains we have made since critical problems in American education were identified in the 1983 report "A Nation at Risk." A national role in education reform, and basic investments in educating and training people, are essential to ensuring the strength of our country's future.

1201 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20005-3917
202·289·2888 · FAX 202·289·1303 · TDD 202·289·2977

I urge you to continue the level of funding provided in FY 1995 appropriations for Goals 2000 as you finalize the FY 1996 appropriations bill.

Sincerely,

W. H. Kolberg

William H. Kolberg
President

Procter&Gamble

JOHN E. PEPPER
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive

September 7, 1995

General Offices
The Procter & Gamble Company
One Procter & Gamble Plaza
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-3315

The Honorable Peter Domenici
United States Senate
328 Hart Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Domenici,

I am writing you on a subject to which I have devoted more of my effort over the past decade than any other apart from my family and my work, and that is public education.

Specifically, I am writing to share my strong convictions with you on the importance of the continued funding of Goals 2000. I know you have been a strong long-term supporter of public education. I know that the 1996 U.S. House of Representatives appropriations bill as it now stands would not include funding for this program. I think this would be a tragic mistake.

There are two major things which this legislation does which are absolutely imperative.

The first of these is to establish at the national and state level standards of achievement that our children must meet in order to be competitive with children graduating from schools in other global economies. You and I both know that there is great truth to the saying that you "get what you measure". We are still in the early stages of communicating to the American public and, indeed, to many in the educational community, the importance of meeting high standards and taking accountability for doing so. Failure to continue the Goals 2000 Act/Educate America Act would represent a tremendous setback to this effort.

The second part of this legislation that is so important is the stimulus that it is providing to the states and communities to accelerate their reform efforts. I understand that 48 states have received first year Goals 2000 funds. I have personally reviewed the projects that are being funded in Ohio. Several of them are in Cincinnati. While no one of them will be a magic panacea, they are grass roots efforts that can become breakthrough success models.

Goals 2000 is, of course, only a part of the massive effort that must be placed to achieve the educational improvements our country needs. Most of what needs to be done must be done at the state and, above all, local levels. However, I firmly believe that while this isn't a perfect act, the great majority of the spending and its two key thrusts on establishing measures and supplementing local reform efforts are sound and essential and should be continued. Moreover, cancellation of this effort would be a terribly serious setback to this nation's educational reform effort.

I would be glad to answer any questions you may have. If there are other individuals you think I should communicate my convictions to, I would appreciate your letting me know who they are.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

J. E. PEPPER

CC Mr. J. T. Gorman

Whirlpool

ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER • BENTON HARBOR, MICHIGAN 49022

DAVID R. WHITWAM
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
AND
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

September 11, 1995

The Honorable Christopher Bond
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Bond:

The Senate Education Appropriations Subcommittee will soon take up action on FY'96 funding for the "Goals 2000: Educate America Act." As you know, the House dropped funding for this program in its FY '96 budget plan -- in effect, removing any role for Washington in helping to establish academic standards for K-12 public education.

While I agree with the general direction Congress is taking to rein in wasteful spending, I also believe that some government services are so fundamental at a national level that Washington must remain a key player and provide ongoing budget support. I believe that public education is one of these, particularly Goals 2000's pivotal role for Washington in defining and promoting rigorous education standards for our nation's primary and secondary schools.

The quality of education in America is in crisis. As test scores show repeatedly, America's youths are not competitive with their international peers. The opportunity cost to the nation of Washington abandoning Goals 2000 is too great, in terms of a lower standard of living, overall diminished business and social productivity, and weakened global competitiveness.

All three presidents since *A Nation at Risk* first documented our educational deficiencies recognized a need and envisoned a federal role in education reform. Should Washington back away at this time, a leadership void will ensue, since state and local governments are not pursuing quality education initiatives on a consistent basis. Without Washington's leadership and budgetary support, education reform in America will die.

Defunding Goals 2000 would be wrong and short-sighted. President Clinton's $750 million funding request for FY'96 is not excessive. However, I realize that education must also share in budget reductions. I encourage you, then, to support Goals 2000 funding at the FY'95 level of $372 million -- less than half of the Administration's budget proposal. Thank you.

Sincerely,

David Whitwam

STATE-BY-STATE CONGRESSIONAL CONTACTS AND BUSINESS

Note: Italics indicates a "Super-contact."
* Representative focused by NEA Advertisement.

ALABAMA

Business: BellSouth, NationsBank, Alabama Power, Alabama Gas, Russell Corporation, Arkla

Senator Howell Heflin (D)
Representative Glen Browder (D)
Representative Bud Cramer (D)*

Senator Shelby

<u>ALASKA</u>

Business: Unocal, Alyeska Pipeline

Senator Ted Stevens (R)

<u>ARKANSAS</u>

Business: ALLTEL, Arkansas Power and Light, Tysons Food,

Representative Blanche Lambert-Lincoln (D)

<u>CALIFORNIA</u>

Business: Pacific Telesis, BankAmerica, LeviStrauss, Gap, Hewlett Packard, Apple, Chevron, Silicon Graphics, Sun Microsystems, Pacific Gas & Electric, Southern California Edison, Southern California Gas, Kaiser Permenante, Oracle

Representative Gary Condit (D)
Representative Steve Horn (R)
Representative Brian Bilbray (R)*

<u>COLORADO</u>

Business: USWest, Burlington Railroad, Hewlett Packard, United Airlines, Samsonite, TCI, Gates Rubber, Container Industries, Conoco, Great West Life Assurance, Colorado Interstate Gas,

Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell (R)

CONNECTICUT

Business: Union Carbide, NYNEX, GTE, General Electric, Aetna Life, Champion International, United Technologies, Thomson Publishing, Xerox,

Senator Joe Liebermann (D)
Representative Gary Franks (R)*
Representative Nancy Johnson (R)*

DELAWARE

Business: Dupont, Hercules, Bell Atlantic

Representative Michael Castle (R)

FLORIDA

Business: Florida Power and Light, Ryder Trucks, Alamo, NationsBank, American Bankers Insurance, Burger King, Tampa Electric, Sun Banks

Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R)*
Representative Lincoln Diaz-Balart (R)*

GEORGIA

Business: BellSouth, United Parcel Service, Delta Airlines, Coca Cola, NationsBank, Georgia Power, Equifax, Georgia Pacific, Atlanta Gas Light, Home Depot, Turner Broadcasting, Cox Enterprises

Senator Sam Nunn (D)

ILLINOIS

Business: Baxter International, Ameritech, Allstate Insurance, State Farm Insurance, McDonald's, Amoco, Carus Corp, Central Illinois Public Service, CNA Insurance, Commonwealth Edison, Continental Bank, Curtis Industries, Florsheim Shoes, Illinois Central Railroad, Illinois Power, Kraft Foods, Sears, United Airlines

Representative Glenn Poshard (D)

KANSAS

Business: Boeing, Pizza Hut, Cessna Aircraft, Beech Aircraft, Sprint, Coleman Co., SBC Communications

Senator Nancy Kassebaum (R)

KENTUCKY

Business: United Parcel Service, Humana, Ashland Oil, BellSouth, Courier Journal, Louisville Gas and Electric, Kentucky Utilities,

Representative Scott Baesler (D)

LOUISIANA

Business: Union Carbide, Entergy, Arkla, Cajun Electric, Shell, Louisiana Gas, Louisiana Power & Light, Southwestern Electric Power, BellSouth

Senator John Breaux (D)
Senator Bennett Johnston (D)
Representative Jimmy Hayes (D)*

MAINE

Business: UNUM, NYNEX, Tom's of Maine,

Senator William Cohen (R)
Senator Olympia Snowe (R)

MARYLAND

Business: BellAtlantic, Baltimore Gas & Electric, Marriott, Lockheed Martin, Black and Decker, Perdue, Discovery Channel, Manor Care, USF&G, Rouse, Ryland Group, Giant, Hechinger

Senator Barbara Mikulski (D)
Representative Wayne Gilchrest (R)*
Representative Constance Morella (R)

MASSACHUSSETTS

Business: NYNEX, Continental Cable, Digital Equipment, Lotus, Boston Edison, Boston Gas, Gillette, John Hancock, New Balance, Reebok, Polaroid, Allmerica Financial, Stride Rite, Tom McAn, Raytheon,

Representative Peter Blute (R)*
Representative Peter Torkildsen (R)

MINNESOTA

Business: Cray Computer, Ameritech, General Mills, Honeywell, Ceridian, Dayton Hudson, IDS Financial, Minnesota Power and Light, 3M,

Representative Collin Peterson (D)

MISSISSIPPI

Business: BellSouth, Mississippi Power, Mississippi Power & Light,

Senator Thad Cochran (R)
Representative Sonny Montgomery (D)
Representative Mike Parker (D)
Representative Gene Taylor (D)*

MISSOURI

Business: SBC Communications, McDonnell Douglas, Monsanto, Hallmark, Tension Envelopes, Ralston Purina, Laclede Gas, Kansas City Power & Light, Union Electric, TWA

Senator Christopher Bond (R)
Representative Pat Danner (D)

MONTANA

Business: Montana Power, Union Pacific, IBM, USWest

Senator Max Baucus (D)

NEBRASKA

Business: USWest, World Herald, Berkshire Hathaway, ConAgra, Omaha Steaks, Noddle Construction, Omaha Mutual Insurance

Senator James Exon (D)
Senator Bob Kerrey (D)
Representative Doug Bereuter (R)

NEW JERSEY

Business: AT&T, NYNEX, Prudential, Public Service Electric and Gas, Merck, Johnson & Johnson

Senator Bill Bradley (D)

NEW MEXICO

Business: Sandia National Lab, Sunwest Bank, Public Service of New Mexico

Senator Pete Domenici (R)

NEW YORK

Business: AT&T, NYNEX, IBM, Time Warner, Eastman Kodak, ITT, Pepsico, RJR Nabisco, K III, Corning

Representative Sherwood Beohlert (R)*
Representative Jack Quinn (R)*
Representative Amo Houghton (R)*

NORTH DAKOTA

Business: US West,

Senator Kent Conrad (D)
Senator Byron Dorgan (D)

OHIO

Business: Ameritech, Procter & Gamble, TRW, BFGoodrich, GenCorp, Smuckers, Kroger,

Senator John Glenn (D)
Senator Mike DeWine (R)
Representative Bob Ney (R)*

OKLAHOMA

Business: SBC Communications, Oklahoma Gas & Electric

Representative Bill Brewster (D)*

OREGON

Business: Nike, USWest, Portland General Electric

Senator Mark Hatfield (R)

PENNSYLVANIA

Business: Alcoa, BellAtlantic, Binney&Smith, Cigna, UGI Corp, Air Products,

Senator Arlen Specter (R)

RHODE ISLAND

Business: NYNEX, Providence Gas,

Senator John Chafee (R)

SOUTH CAROLINA

Business: Springs Industries, Insigna,

Senator Fritz Hollings (D)

TENNESSEE

Business: BellSouth, Federal Express, Northern Telecom, Eastman Chemical

Senator Bill Frist (R)

TEXAS

Business: SBC Communications, DEll, Compaq, JCPEnney, Tandy, Texas Instruments, ALLTEL, GTE, Houston Power, LaQuinta Motor Inns, Shell, Exxon, Pier 1, USAA Insurance, Tenneco, Sprint

Representative Ralph Hall (D)
Representative Peter Geren (D)
Representative Charlie Stenholm (D)*

UTAH

Business: USWest, Novell, Utah Power & Light

Representative William Orton (D)

VERMONT

Business: NYNEX, Ben & Jerry's, IBM

Senator Jim Jeffords (R)

VIRGINIA

Business: Circuit City, BellAtlantic, Gannett, CSX Corp., Mobil,

Senator Chuck Robb (D)
Representative Lewis Payne (D)*

WASHINGTON

Business: USWest, Boeing, Weyerhauser, Microsoft,

Senator Slade Gorton (R)

WEST VIRGINIA

Business: Ashland Oil, Bell Atlantic, Union Carbide,

Senator Robert Byrd (D)

WISCONSIN

Business: Ameritech, Harley Davidson, Badger Meter, Oshkosh b'gosh

Representative Steve Gunderson (R)*

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESS

Over 25 Years of Helping America Work

November 30, 1995

TO: Board of Directors
Business Policy Council

FROM: Roberts T. Jones
Executive Vice President

SUBJECT: Contacting Members of Congress to Urge Support for Federal Funding of Goals 2000 Education Reform Grants

---

Between now and December 15, Republican leaders in the House of Representatives and the Senate will be negotiating with the White House and congressional Democrats over their balanced budget and spending priorities. It is a crucial window of time in which key decisions could be made affecting future. national investments in education and training. Members of Congress need to hear from business leaders who feel strongly about the importance of maintaining investments in this area of national policy, particularly for education reform activities under the ***Goals 2000: Educate America Act***.

The House of Representatives' recently passed version of the FY 1996 appropriations bill (H.R. 2127) for programs under the Departments of Labor and Education provided <u>no</u> funds for Goals 2000. The Senate version would appropriate $310 million for Goals 2000. <u>House Republican Leaders and committee negotiators need to hear that business supports this funding for education reform in the states and that a final compromise bill should provide the $310 million for Goals 2000</u>.

Attached is a list of the House leaders and appropriations committee members who will be involved in negotiating the final compromise and a summary of key arguments for continued funding. Now is the time to write or call key members, especially those members from districts where you have a major presence

Business has supported this bipartisan national initiative from the beginning in partnership with the President, the Governors, and the Congress. The federal investment in Goals 2000 is seed money with the unique ability to generate major innovations and to leverage other state and local funds. For FY 1995, Congress appropriated $372 million for this initiative. All but four states have received the first year's grants and are proceeding with improvement plans. Within the context of balancing the budget, this federal commitment to the states should continue.

1201 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20005-3917
202-289-2888 · FAX 202-289-1303 · TDD 202-289-2977

KEY NEGOTIATORS ON FY 1996 APPROPRIATIONS

104th Congress, (1995-1996)

LEADERSHIP -- *U.S. House of Representatives*

*Newt Gingrich (R-GA), Speaker of the House (Northern Atlanta suburbs, Roswell, part of Marietta)
*Dick Armey (R-TX), Majority Leader (Suburban Dallas, parts of Irving and Denton)
*Tom DeLay (R-TX), Majority Whip (Southwest Houston & suburbs, Fort Bend and Brazoria Counties)
*John Boehner (R-OH), Chairman, House Republican Conference (Southwest, Hamilton, Middletown)
*Robert L. Livingston (R-LA), Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations (Metairie, NO suburbs)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

U.S. House of Representatives

Republicans

*John Edward Porter (R-IL), Chairman
(Northwest Chicago, Waukegan, Wilmette)
*C.S. Bill Young (R-FL)
(St. Petersburg, S. Pinellas County)
*Henry Bonilla (R-TX)
(Southwest Texas, San Antonio suburbs)
*Ernest Jim Istook (R-OK)
(Northcentral Okla., & N.W. part of Oklahoma City)
*Dan Miller (R-FL)
(Sarasota, Manatee County, Bradenton)
*Jay Dickey (R-AR)
(South Arkansas, Pine Bluff, Hot Springs)
*Frank Riggs (R-CA)
(Northern Coast, Eureka)
*Roger F. Wicker (R-MS)
(North Mississippi, Tupelo)

Democrats

*David Obey (D-WI), Ranking Minority Member
(Northwest Wisc., Wausau, Superior, Stevens Point)
*Louis Stokes (D-OH)
(East side Cleveland & suburbs)
*Steny H. Hoyer (D-MD)
(Prince George's County, Southern Maryland)
*Nancy Pelosi (D-CA)
(San Francisco)
*Nita M. Lowey (D-NY)
(Parts of Westchester, Bronx, and Queens Counties)

Address: Honorable (name), U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.
Capitol Switchboard: (202) 225-3121

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

United States Senate

Republicans

Arlen Specter (R-PA), Chairman
Mark O. Hatfield (R-OR)
*Thad Cochran (R-MS)
*Slade Gorton (R-WA)
*Connie Mack (R-FL)
*Christopher (Kit) Bond (R-MO)
James M. Jeffords (R-VT)
*Judd Gregg (R-NH)

Democrats

Tom Harkin (D-IA), Ranking Minority Member
Robert C. Byrd (D-WV)
Ernest F. Hollings (D-SC)
Daniel K. Inouye (D-HI)
Dale Bumpers (D-AR)
Harry Reid (D-NV)
Herb Kohl (D-WI)

Address: Honorable (name), United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.
Capitol Switchboard: (202) 224-3121

* = Members to contact and inform about business support for Goals 2000 funding.

BUSINESS VIEWS
ON FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING

- Business supports funding for Goals 2000 education reform grants going to the states at the level in Senate version of the FY 1996 appropriations legislation. Any final compromise bill should include funding for these grants. (House of Representatives' version = $0). (Senate version = $310 million).

- America's business leaders strongly support the goal of reducing the federal deficit and balancing the budget for the nation's long-term fiscal health.

- Efforts to reduce federal spending require decisions to reform, consolidate, eliminate, and innovate current programs. As this occurs, government leaders must set priorities by reducing or eliminating some programs and enhancing investments in others to balance the budget. It is the view of business leaders, in nearly every community, that one critical investment to maintain in government priorities is the investment in education and training. These investments are the foundation for this society's future economic growth and social strength. Goals 2000 embodies this principle and continued federal funding should be supported.

- For American business, the knowledge and skills of employees are the critical factors for economic success and international competitiveness. Yet, we continue to find that job seekers are less prepared or less able to compete in the modern workplace. High performance workplaces and advancing technology require ever-changing skills. Education and training investments at the federal, state, and local levels are essential to enable both businesses and individuals to sustain the standard of living that Americans expect.

- The federal investment is unique for its ability to act as seed money to design major improvements and innovations that leverage other state and local funds. Federal leadership has been crucial to the gains we have made in public education since critical problems were identified in the 1983 report "A Nation At Risk." Federal funds also play a unique role in dealing with major, unforeseen crises in state and local systems.

- It is appropriate for the Congress to oversee and change program policies, but the simple, national leadership role in education reform, and the basic investments in educating and training people, are essential to ensuring the strength of our country's future.

National Alliance of Business

Over 25 Years of Helping America Work

November 30, 1995

TO: Board of Directors
Business Policy Council

FROM: Roberts T. Jones
Executive Vice President

SUBJECT: Contacting Members of Congress to Urge Support for Federal Funding of Goals 2000 Education Reform Grants

---

Between now and December 15, Republican leaders in the House of Representatives and the Senate will be negotiating with the White House and congressional Democrats over their balanced budget and spending priorities. It is a crucial window of time in which key decisions could be made affecting future national investments in education and training. Members of Congress need to hear from business leaders who feel strongly about the importance of maintaining investments in this area of national policy, particularly for education reform activities under the ***Goals 2000: Educate America Act***.

The House of Representatives' recently passed version of the FY 1996 appropriations bill (H.R. 2127) for programs under the Departments of Labor and Education provided no funds for Goals 2000. The Senate version would appropriate $310 million for Goals 2000. House Republican Leaders and committee negotiators need to hear that business supports this funding for education reform in the states and that a final compromise bill should provide the $310 million for Goals 2000.

Attached is a list of the House leaders and appropriations committee members who will be involved in negotiating the final compromise and a summary of key arguments for continued funding. Now is the time to write or call key members, especially those members from districts where you have a major presence.

Business has supported this bipartisan national initiative from the beginning in partnership with the President, the Governors, and the Congress. The federal investment in Goals 2000 is seed money with the unique ability to generate major innovations and to leverage other state and local funds. For FY 1995, Congress appropriated $372 million for this initiative. All but four states have received the first year's grants and are proceeding with improvement plans. Within the context of balancing the budget, this federal commitment to the states should continue.

2

1201 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20005-3917
202·289·2888 FAX 202·289·1303 · TDD 202·289·2977

KEY NEGOTIATORS ON FY 1996 APPROPRIATIONS

104th Congress, (1995-1996)

LEADERSHIP -- *U.S. House of Representatives*

*Newt Gingrich (R-GA), Speaker of the House (Northern Atlanta suburbs, Roswell, part of Marietta)
*Dick Armey (R-TX), Majority Leader (Suburban Dallas, parts of Irving and Denton)
*Tom DeLay (R-TX), Majority Whip (Southwest Houston & suburbs, Fort Bend and Brazoria Counties)
*John Boehner (R-OH), Chairman, House Republican Conference (Southwest, Hamilton, Middletown)
*Robert L. Livingston (R-LA), Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations (Metairie, NO suburbs)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION
U.S. House of Representatives

Republicans

*John Edward Porter (R-IL), Chairman
(Northwest Chicago, Waukegan, Wilmette)
*C.S. Bill Young (R-FL)
(St. Petersburg, S. Pinellas County)
*Henry Bonilla (R-TX)
(Southwest Texas, San Antonio suburbs)
*Ernest Jim Istook (R-OK)
(Northcentral Okla., & N.W. part of Oklahoma City)
*Dan Miller (R-FL)
(Sarasota, Manatee County, Bradenton)
*Jay Dickey (R-AR)
(South Arkansas, Pine Bluff, Hot Springs)
*Frank Riggs (R-CA)
(Northern Coast, Eureka)
*Roger F. Wicker (R-MS)
(North Mississippi, Tupelo)

Democrats

*David Obey (D-WI), Ranking Minority Member
(Northwest Wisc., Wausau, Superior, Stevens Point)
*Louis Stokes (D-OH)
(East side Cleveland & suburbs)
*Steny H. Hoyer (D-MD)
(Prince George's County, Southern Maryland)
*Nancy Pelosi (D-CA)
(San Francisco)
*Nita M. Lowey (D-NY)
(Parts of Westchester, Bronx, and Queens Counties)

Address: Honorable (name), U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.
Capitol Switchboard: (202) 225-3121

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION
United States Senate

Republicans

Arlen Specter (R-PA), Chairman
Mark O. Hatfield (R-OR)
*Thad Cochran (R-MS)
*Slade Gorton (R-WA)
*Connie Mack (R-FL)
*Christopher (Kit) Bond (R-MO)
James M. Jeffords (R-VT)
*Judd Gregg (R-NH)

Democrats

Tom Harkin (D-IA), Ranking Minority Member
Robert C. Byrd (D-WV)
Ernest F. Hollings (D-SC)
Daniel K. Inouye (D-HI)
Dale Bumpers (D-AR)
Harry Reid (D-NV)
Herb Kohl (D-WI)

Address: Honorable (name), United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.
Capitol Switchboard: (202) 224-3121

* = Members to contact and inform about business support for Goals 2000 funding.

JOHN EDWARD PORTER
10TH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEES:
FOREIGN OPERATIONS
LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION
CHAIRMAN
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
CONGRESSIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS
CO-CHAIRMAN

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–1310

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
2373 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–1310
(202) 225–4835

HOME OFFICES:
102 WILMOT ROAD
SUITE 200
DEERFIELD, IL 60015–5100
(708) 940–0202

18 NORTH COUNTY STREET
WAUKEGAN, IL 60085–4339
(708) 662–0101

115 ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD
SUITE 104
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60004–2862
(708) 392–0303

December 8, 1995

Dr. Jean McGrew
Superintendent of Schools
Glenbrook TWP H.S. Dist. 225
1835 Landwehr Road
Glenview, IL 60025

Dear Jean:

I received your communication regarding the 1st in the World Consortium. I am very proud of the work that you are doing.

As I believe you know, I have written to Secretary Riley to request the Department's continued support for the work of 1st in the World Consortium and for its help in initiating the administering the Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS) to the Consortium's students. I have enclosed a copy of my letter and the Secretary's response.

Regarding appropriations for Goals 2000, as you know the allocation my Subcommittee received for drafting the annual appropriations bill for the departments of Education, Health & Human Services, and Labor and related agencies was reduced by $9.3 billion, or 13%, below the fiscal year enacted level. Consequently, the House did not include any funding for Goals 2000. The Senate did not require the same level of reductions in programs under the Subcommittee's jurisdiction, providing approximately $1.5 billion more for these activities. The Senate Subcommittee provided $310 million for GOALS 2000. However, for reasons other than funding level concerns, the full Senate has been unable to bring the appropriations bill up for consideration. Once the Senate's version of the appropriations bill is adopted by the full Senate, a House-Senate Conference Committee will meet to reconcile the differences between the two versions of the bill and negotiate a final bill which can be sent to the President. The President is requesting Goals 2000 funding in his budget negotiations with the Congress, and I therefore believe that the final legislation that is sent to the President will include funding for Goals 2000.

I appreciate your contacting me regarding the Consortium's agenda, and I hope you will continue to feel free to contact me whenever issues of concern to you come before the Congress.

Sincerely,

John Edward Porter
Member of Congress

JEP:sec
Enclosures

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103-2682
FAX NUMBER: 619/293-8267

TO: Mike Cohen DATE: 12/13/95

FAX NUMBER: (202) 401-0596

DOCUMENT TITLE: Urgent

FROM: Frank Till PHONE NO. (619) 293-8034

MESSAGE: 4 pages enclosed

Please advise, at phone number above, if this message is received unreadable or incomplete. If you are sending a return fax message, please indicate complete name and phone number of the person you are addressing.

SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER • 4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103-2682 • (619) 293-8418
Fax: (619) 291-7182

BERTHA O. PENDLETON
Superintendent

November 17, 1995

The Honorable Randy "Duke" Cunningham
Member, U.S. House of Representatives, District 51
227 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Cunningham:

As superintendent of the San Diego Unified School District, the eighth largest school district in the nation, I have strong concerns about the direction Congress is taking in the FY96 budget reconciliation and appropriations bills. The proposed cuts in federal funding for local education will hurt 130,000 students at more than 161 sites in the district.

I urge you to work with the President and the House leadership to forge a bipartisan agreement that invests in education to secure the future of our children. Please support a budget agreement that makes education investment a priority. Attached is a brief analysis of the impact H.R. 2127 will have specifically on this district. You will see that the district will lose at a minimum $10 million in fiscal year 1996. Additional federal reductions in reimbursements for school lunch, child nutrition, and Medicaid will further cripple district resources.

The San Diego Unified School District is committed to both educational and operational reform. The substantial loss of federal funds will directly impact students who need services most. These funds go directly to schools and programs for children. There are no general funds to compensate the loss. It has become popular to deplore student achievement. The very resources needed to meet the high standards we all want must not be taken away.

Your past support of this district and the children of San Diego is much appreciated. Your support is vital to the students of San Diego.

Sincerely,

Bertha,

Bertha O. Pendleton
Superintendent

BOP:bb

Enc.

C/Legis/Cong/11.15.95

BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS
EDUCATION CENTER • 4100 Normal Street, San Diego, California 92103-2682
(619) 293-8562/8029
FAX (619) 297-5624

November 27, 1995

The Honorable Randall (Duke) Cunningham
U.S. Representative, 51st District
227 Cannon House Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Cunningham:

The Board of Education of the San Diego Unified School District urges you to work with the President and the House leadership to forge a bipartisan agreement that invests in education to secure the future of our children. Please support a budget agreement that makes education investment a priority. Attached is a brief analysis of the impact H.R. 2127 will have specifically on this district. You will see that the district will lose at a minimum 10 million dollars in fiscal year 1996, affecting over 130,000 students at more than 161 sites. Additional federal reductions in reimbursements for school lunch, child nutrition and Medicaid will further cripple district resources.

We support efforts to reduce the federal deficit and restore fiscal responsibility. It is shortsighted to do so at the expense of investment in education. Only an increased investment will expand educational opportunities, generate the economic growth needed to reduce the deficit and ensure the prosperity and well being of our nation. The San Diego Unified School District is committed to both educational and operational reform. The substantial loss of federal funds will directly impact students who need services most. These funds go directly to schools and programs for children. There are no general funds to compensate the loss. It has become popular to deplore student achievement. The very resources needed to meet the high standards we all want must not be taken away.

Your past support of this district and the children of San Diego is much appreciated. Your support is vital to the students of San Diego.

Sincerely,

Ron Ottinger
President

Ann Armstrong
Vice President

Sue Braun
Member

John de Beck
Member

Shirley N. Weber, Ph.D.
Member

BP:nov

Impact of FY 96 Congressional Budget Appropriations
November 13, 1995

This analysis estimates the impact of the proposed cuts in federal funding for local education on the San Diego Unified School District and is based on the Federal Budget Appropriations in H.R. 2127 approved by the U.S. House of Representatives August 4, 1995.

Program	$ funding loss	#of students served	#of schools impacted
Title I	$3.5 million	11,000	50 eliminated
Impact Aid	$ 700,000	127,000	all affected
Goals 2000	$ 204,000.	19,000	22 eliminated
Bilingual Ed	$1 million	31,000	all affected
School-to-Work	$ 140,000.	17,000	14
Magnet Schools	$3 million/yr.	10,000	12
Safe & Drug Free Schools	$ 500,000.	127,000	all affected

- Based on the U.S. House of Representatives Federal Budget Appropriations for FY 96, the San Diego Unified School District will lose almost 10 million dollars.
- Every student and every school in the district will be impacted.
- Particularly hard hit will be those students and schools most in need. Schools with a high number of students/families in poverty will receive the deepest and most severe cuts.
- The district will lose at least 17% of the anticipated FY96-97 Title I funding. These proposed cuts will devastate the Title I program currently operating in the district. A total of fifty schools will be eliminated from the program (39 elementary, 8 middle and 3 Senior High). Given the general decline California (especially schools) suffered during the last five years, this comes as a double blow. The very resources needed to attain the high student achievement we all want will be taken away from 11,000 children.
- Title I students who are bussed to 33 desegregated schools will no longer receive support. This is a disincentive to our successful integration program.
- Other services provided for students will be eliminated including support to maintain safe and drug free schools, support for getting technology into the classroom and support for upgrading teacher skills.