

away, then the message that will be sent is a very chilling one for the community, and it is also a very chilling one for every Member of this House. Because in next year's election cycle, when individuals, and there have been many individuals here who have won by much less than 900 votes, and their challenger simply claims fraud, and that is sufficient to go ahead and keep them out there for that whole period of time without proof of fraud sufficient to overturn the election, it becomes a dangerous precedent, not only for this institution, for the Members, but more importantly, for our democratic process. We have a right to a speedy determination of whether or not an individual has been duly elected.

Yes, we should take the time to make sure that that person is duly elected, but one year and several hundreds of thousands of dollars later, and with a process that is flawed and that continues to be flawed, where the minority is deprived of rights and where one of the contestants is deprived of rights and information, as we witnessed here today, and heard from her here today, that is an outrage. That outrage will be felt across the land over the next 2 weeks.

THE CONTESTED ELECTION IN CALIFORNIA'S 46TH DISTRICT

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the last gentleman who spoke in the well states his own opinions as fact. The gentleman is factually challenged. Let me go with some specifics.

First of all, it is a fact that every voter was looked at, not by surname, but every single voter. I am of Irish descent, but I would want to make sure that every voter that voted, whether they are Irish or of any ethnic background, had a legal right to do that. That is the issue.

They cannot win over the majority based on issues. They want bigger government, they want higher taxes, they want big government control. They do not want a balanced budget. They do not want tax relief. They want a centralized Federal Government. So what do they do? They try to scare up the minorities to think the Republicans are going after them. Every single voter was looked at, not by surname. That is incorrect.

Second, for 7 months, 7 months, they refused to comply with subpoenas both from an individual, Mr. Dornan, which the Supreme Court held up, or from the committee. So now they are even bucking the Supreme Court decision to comply with the subpoenas.

What were the subpoenas for? To find out the information, to find out the facts. Seven months, and it went into 8 months, and now they are saying a year is too long. Yes, it is too long. If

we would have been able to get the facts, then it would have been over by now.

The rights of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), her rights have not been violated. She is a sitting member of this committee and of this House. But until we find out the facts, and from the facts that have been found, there was fraud. That is fact. It is documented. It is documented over and over and over again. The amount of fraud is the question. We have facts and we have figures that were delivered to the minority and to the committee. All we are asking before we go forward is to make sure that the State verifies the facts. We will live with those facts if they are verified, or not. That is the question.

But yet the gentleman over there, they cannot win, so what do they want to do? They want to scare people with surnames, to think that the Republicans are bad people, so they can take over a majority. Well, it is not going to work, because they are smarter than that, Mr. Speaker. I resent, I resent the racist implication. I resent the other side of the aisle making this a racist issue.

The issue is that every single American, as few of them that show up at the polls, want to know that their vote counts, that it is not being canceled out by someone that is not qualified to vote. That is the issue. It is not just in California, it is in Texas, it is in Arizona, it is in every State of the Union. This is bigger than Dornan and bigger than Sanchez.

This is that the American people want to know that their rights count, and that it is not going to be taken away by someone that is fraudulently voting. They do not want that. They want to win at any means, whether it is the DNC taking money from Charlie Huang and Trie and Riady and Chinese money, or the Vice President doing Buddhist monk fund-raisers and the money going to DNC, or whether it is from illegal contributions from the Teamsters, who two people have already pled guilty of laundering money to the DNC for campaigns for the Democrats. They do not want us to know that.

All we are doing is asking, when people go to vote, they want to know that the campaign laws are upheld and not violated, and that someone that wants to vote, their vote counts. I do not care if it is an Irish American that is voting that should not be, or someone from Ireland that is a citizen, that vote should not count and that individual should be taken a look at.

Another fact, the State—the alleged fraud, where the gentleman said, show us the fraud, we have. There is fraud. One liberal group alone had over 300 votes verified, documented by the State. That is why we are asking for these others. The other thousands of votes and fraudulent, allegedly fraudulent votes, we are asking the State to verify that. That is fair, Mr. Speaker.

There is nothing racist about that. Guess what, they are not by surname. They are not by any surname. They are looking at every single vote.

□ 2015

But yet my colleague on the other side would like you to think, so he can get the support of certain minorities in his own election and other Democrat elections so they can retake the majority. But yet they will not support a balanced budget, they will not support tax reform. They will not support welfare reform. They cannot win on the issues, so they will play the "R" word, and I resent that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I had not planned on speaking about that. I was going to speak with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] on education, which I will continue to do. But I cannot sit here and let facts be disillusioned before this body, the challenged facts go uncontested, because they are wrong and they are incorrect.

REPUBLICAN VISION FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would be more than willing to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], but only on one condition. The gentleman has got to get the name right. It is not "HOEK-STR" it is "Hoekstra." If the gentleman wants to start tonight and talk a little bit about education, that would be fine with me if he would like to go first.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, first of all, thank the gentleman, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight. I think it is fair to take a look at the education programs to see if they are good or they are not. A good example is the President wanted a \$3 billion new literacy program. We failed, were last of the industrial nations in literacy here in the United States of America. The President wanted a \$3 billion literacy program. It sounds good. But there are 14 literacy programs within the Federal Government. Title I is one of those. I would think it would be fair to look and say which of the 14 are good? Can we take one or two, get rid of all the bureaucracies, all the pay for all of those staffs and all of those buildings and focus and say, that is wasted money? Let us put the money in the one or two programs that really work.

Mr. Speaker, if it is title I, fund it. But do it fully instead of just halfway doing it. And the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] are doing that. They are going through the over 760 programs, now, and identifying which are correct

and which ones that we should absolutely support.

But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would demagogue to say well, the Republicans are cutting education if they eliminate those programs, even though we are getting more money down to the classroom and to the Zip Code.

Mr. Speaker, I would say this, that this last weekend I attended public school teachers' outstanding teachers in San Diego County. I saw parents lauding those public teachers. I saw children lauding their teachers like we would want. I was a teacher myself in high school, and a coach. I was a college teacher and a coach and a dean of a college. My children went through public schools. I still have a daughter in a public school, a sophomore. I truly believe that one of the keys for this great country is a solid public education program and the investment in that.

But is it not fair, Mr. Speaker, to ask what programs that we can put into those school systems and fully fund and the Jaime Escalantes of this country to encourage teachers and pay teachers finally what they are worth, instead of paying some bureaucrat in Washington, D.C. that is wasting the money?

The average is less than 48 cents per dollar that gets down to the classroom. Is it not fair to say we want at least 90 percent, which this body is going to have a chance to vote on? We want 90 percent of the money from the Federal Government to go to the classroom.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Certainly I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I think this is really an important point, that what the gentleman is saying here, and this is one of the numbers we are trying to get a handle on and I thought it was closer to 60, either one of which is not very good. But what the gentleman is saying is the GAO study, our work on the committee says maybe it is 60 cents but for every dollar that comes out of our hometown that comes to Washington and then leaves here in the form of an education dollar, that of the dollar that comes here somewhere between 52 cents, 40 to 52 cents never leaves here.

So a dollar that comes here; only between 48 cents and 60 cents actually gets back to what we have found is the most effective place for education, which is in the classroom with the teacher under parental and local control. That is the leverage point, that somewhere we lose almost half of every education dollar here in Washington.

Next week, the gentleman from California is absolutely right, we are going to have that debate here on the floor where a resolution that says our vision for the future is that at most for every dollar that comes to Washington, only 10 cents stays here and 90 cents—well, actually only 10 cents is lost between

Washington and the classroom, which means the State bureaucracies and that. We want to get 90 cents to the teacher who knows my child's name, and into the classroom where my child sits in the school that is run by the school board that we elect. That is where we want to get the money to.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I compliment the gentleman for his work in this area. He came to Phoenix, Arizona, to my hometown and held a hearing, "Education at the Crossroads: What works and what doesn't?" And I also thank my colleague from California for joining us in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell my colleagues that I feel an immense sense of urgency tonight on the topic that we are talking about; that is, education and the whole question of getting money into the classroom, because right now there is a grave threat posed to education in America. It is a feel-good, sound-good idea called national testing.

It is this idea that we ought to adopt in America a single reading test for every fourth grader in America, and a single reading test for every eighth grader in America. It is a proposal that the President made on the floor of this House in his State of the Union speech last January which, as the gentleman I know already knows, the President has already implemented. That is, he created a test panel and has written that test.

Now, a lot of my colleagues in Arizona say, and my friends at home say, "Well, Congressman, what is wrong with national testing? Why are you so impassioned in your opposition to national testing and why am I concerned about it here tonight?" Let me explain that. There is a simple concept: What is tested is what will be taught.

Mr. Speaker, I have an 11-year-old son in Arizona, Stephen, and a 15-year-old daughter, about to turn 16 and to start driving, and what they are tested on throughout their education careers has been what they were taught; that is, their teachers, because they want them to perform well, have gone out and ahead of time learned what is on the tests that they will take each year and made sure that they are taught what will be on those tests.

What that means is that if we let this idea of a single national test written in Washington, D.C., thousands of miles from the teacher in Phoenix, Arizona, who knows my son Stephen's name or my daughter Courtney's name, if we let that test be written in Washington, D.C., hundreds of layers of bureaucrats from the administrators in my children's school or the parents in my neighborhood or the parents in the gentleman's neighborhood in Michigan or the gentleman's neighborhood in California, if we let them write that test in Washington, D.C., we will have ceded control over much of the content of education to Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, that I believe is a severe disaster and the Senate is on the

verge of doing it. I hope people will watch tonight and call the Senate and do something about it and urge them not to allow it to happen.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman brings up a very important point. Whether we are talking about dollars, which is what my colleague from California and I started talking about, whether we are talking about testing, whether we are talking about curriculum, we are talking about where is the focal point and where is the decision-making for education? Are we going to move it to bureaucrats here in Washington?

That is exactly what has happened with this testing. We know that we lose somewhere between 40 and 50 cents of every dollar to bureaucrats here in Washington. Was that test written with the Governor of Colorado?

Mr. SHADEGG. No.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. California?

Mr. SHADEGG. No.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Arizona?

Mr. SHADEGG. No.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Michigan?

Mr. SHADEGG. No.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Were they involved?

Mr. SHADEGG. How about the parents?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. No, parents were not involved.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. How about the teachers? Were the teachers involved?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. No, I do not think so. What we have is we have a group of people here in Washington, and you have some other interesting statistics on tests, but the people here in Washington who developed the test that they expect to work in Holland, Michigan, that they expect to work in San Diego, that they expect to work in Fort COLLINS, is that where my colleague from Colorado is from? Close?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Absolutely, Fort Collins.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Phoenix? It is a very different approach. The Clinton administration has said: We know best and we want to take over education.

Mr. Speaker, here is where Republicans have been. Here is where we have been on our Crossroads project. We have been to Milwaukee, New York, actually twice, Chicago twice, we have been to Napa, California. We have been to San Fernando, California; Phoenix; Wilmington, Delaware; Milledgeville, Georgia; the Bronx, Cincinnati; Louisville; Little Rock; Cleveland; Muskegon Heights, Michigan. We are going to Iowa. We are going to Texas.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Riggs has been in San Diego.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Riggs has been in San Diego. We are going to go to Colorado. Number one, we are going to parents and teachers. We have had over 25 educational institutions and hearings that we have visited; 174 grassroots witnesses. They are testifying about their schools, their teachers, and their kids in their hometowns. So we are hearing and we are finding that we

feed parental control, we need a focus on basic academics, and we need to get dollars in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from California because I miss him on the committee. I do not know if he went on to bigger and better things, but he was a great colleague on the committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Well, I am on the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on National Security, and my two passions are national security and education, and I am trying to get on that committee in Appropriations so I can support the authorizers.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, we would love to have the gentleman back.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if we take this dollar and we only have half of it—and I carried this dollar for 40 years because of a lesson that my father taught me, I am not going to get into that today. But if we take half of this dollar and leave it here in Washington, then we are cutting education. That is what has been happening. The liberals that claim that they support education are actually cutting education every single day.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, and what are we trying to do with that dollar?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we are trying to get 90 percent of this dollar down to the Zip Code to where parents, teachers, local administrators, and the community, and I would say family as well, because there are grandparents that want to invest in their children.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman, how do some of our colleagues describe trying to consolidate programs, get rid of red tape, empower parents and local school boards, and get the money back to the local school?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, they demagogue and say it is a cut. A classic example: Last year the President's direct lending program cost \$3 billion to administer, another \$4 billion to collect. GAO study. That was when it was capped at 10 percent.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. But good news on the direct loan program. Right? We had to shut it down this year because they cannot consolidate the loans. I did not bring it with me, oh, I do have it with me. A letter from 75 college students who want to consolidate their loans. What does this mean? It means they are going to take all of their loans that they have gotten for education and put it in one payment. A novel idea?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if I could just finish one thought on it on how we are wasting money for education. That was at 10 percent. When the government shut down the President said he wanted 100 percent of student loans to come out of the government. He wanted government control, bigger bureaucracy. I wanted zero. The leadership decided to let it go to 40 percent so the government could go back. I disagreed.

What they did not see is that we put about six little words in there that saved the money going to the bureaucracy. Did we cut \$10 billion? What did we do with the money? We increased Pell grant the highest level ever. Special education, it is called the IDEA program. We passed that bill. The President signed it and we got more money there.

We increased student loans by 50 percent. But when the gentleman says what do they do, they demagogue and say we are cutting. What we are doing is cutting, whether it is the 13 programs in literacy to focus all the money on the one that works or whether it is on AmeriCorps or whatever it is. We are trying to get the money to the education process.

□ 2030

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I want to make a quick point about the issue of money in the classroom and the point you make rather eloquently, about only half of that dollar getting back home to the classroom.

I hope people understand that when some of us rail against the concept of national testing, they understand that the President did not come forward with a bill proposing national testing in which he suggested that the Congress study the issue and implement legislation. He did not seek dollars being appropriated for national testing. He is doing this all on his own.

He will, if we do not stop him in a vote next week, he will pull money out of everywhere else in the Federal Department of Education budget, monies allocated for other purposes, part of that 50 cents that stays here in Washington, he is going to pull off and give to implement national testing.

I believe our children are tested and tested and tested. And I would like to see, as you both would, that 90 cents out of every dollar get back to the classroom. But it is not going to get back to the classroom if the President is able next week to go forward with his national testing program where he will take another 5, 10 or 15 or 20 cents out of each of those dollars and allocate it to a national test written in Washington, D.C. that you and I do not get to control and that the parents and the teachers and students and the administrators in our school districts do not get to control.

He is going to nationalize testing and use those scarce dollars.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Which we will have to increase taxes to pay for.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. You bring up a couple of good points. The President has not involved parents, teachers, administrators, governors, as a matter of fact, the President has not even involved Congress. We are going to embark on national testing and it is going to be one branch of government, a few elitist bureaucrats who have developed

a test for all of our kids. And we are not even a part of that process.

Mr. SHADEGG. That test will drive the education agenda in America. The handful of textbook publishers in this country who write our students textbooks will write that national test. Can you imagine the amalgamation of power in this small little committee that the President appointed to write this one test and he did an end run around the Congress?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. When you are bringing that out, the testing or whatever it is and the 90 cents of the dollar, I think my colleague from California will agree, we want that 90 cents to go to a local school district, but we want to give them a lot of flexibility as to what they do with it. We do not want to give them 90 cents and then give them a three-ring binder and say, here is how you spend it. We want the parents and local school administrators and local teachers to say, we have got great facilities. We need more computers or we need to invest in books or educational training or whatever.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, who has a great passion for this issue, is on the committee with us, and has really been helpful in us getting some work done in this area.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the gentleman is raising this issue of national testing and the Clinton administration's effort to try to centralize testing here in Washington, D.C. and in fact erode the ability of States and local communities to determine quality on their own terms and their own standards.

I hope people will think of this national testing debate in those terms, because we are not opposed to establishing a national quality standard for measurement of education. We are very much in favor of that. The question on national testing, as the Clinton administration proposes, is one of independence, which we do enjoy today. Independent national testing is a good thing, private organizations, private associations, private panels, private boards that are independent of the government measuring quality throughout the country. That gives us a better idea of how schools in Michigan compare to schools in Colorado that compare to schools in California and so on.

But what the Clinton administration is talking about is something entirely different. And what they are suggesting is that independent measures of quality should be pushed aside, that we should forget about independent measures of quality and instead go to the Clinton model of government defining quality of education for the American people.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague and, just for a moment, yield again to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] who has a great definition because, remember, if it is national testing from the Federal Government, you really will not have an

option as to whether to take it or not. If there are independent testing organizations out there, which there are, schools can pick which one is the best for their schools, which they think is the most appropriate that actually tests knowledge.

My colleague from Arizona has a wonderful example, I believe that is what you are holding up, is how the Federal Government in their new testing program or at least one of the people involved in this defines quality in the types of things we should test. I believe it is in math. Is that what you have there?

Mr. SHADEGG. I do have it here. That is exactly the point. I want to raise a couple of comments.

First of all, my colleague from Colorado is exactly right. It is not that we oppose the ability of people in Arizona or Colorado to compare how our schools are doing with other schools in Michigan or California. And there are tests to do that right now. Two of the best that we all have heard of are the Iowa test of basic skills, which I know I took and my children take, and the Stanford test. Those are independent, privately written national tests which enable us to compare how schools in our neighborhoods are doing or our States are doing with schools halfway across the country.

There are tests to do that and there should be. We support that.

But as my colleague has pointed out, the Clinton proposal is not that we just have the ability to compare. It is that we have the one Federal, correct, written-in-Washington, D.C., written-inside-the-Department-of-Education test and that is where it gets quite scary.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Tell us about the math test. This is the kind of math test that I think, actually this is the kind of math test that bureaucrats would give to bureaucrats, is that not correct?

Mr. SHADEGG. There is no doubt about it. It is a wonderful, feel good math test. My colleague on the other side [Senator ASHCROFT] who is fighting this fight against national testing, points out that it is really the rain forest test, because they ask children more questions about rain forests than they do about their ability to do math.

This, in fact, is the national test in both reading and math as proposed by the national test panel proposed and established by President Clinton. The test is already written and, by the way, my colleague said being talked about by the Clinton administration, the sad truth is, it is not just being talked about, it is about to be implemented. They are ready to go.

But the wonderful thing about this test is that you discover, when you examine it, that in the eighth grade test for math, there is not, I want to say this carefully and slowly so people follow it, there is not one single question which requires eighth graders to do a math computation with a pen and pencil. At no point in the eighth grade

math test already written is there a single question where they are to do a multiplication problem with a pen and pencil or a division problem with a pen and pencil. There is not one single question. Why is that?

It appears that one of the people on this committee, a Mr. Steven Leinwand, a consultant to the Connecticut Education Department, has written a paper and his school of thought has been adopted by the National Association of Mathematics Teachers. And his school of thought is as follows. It is, he writes, downright dangerous to teach children that 6 times 7 is 42. It is dangerous, he says, to teach them basic computational math skills.

Why, you say, does he consider it dangerous? He says it is dangerous, and I quote, because it will annoy the few to master these subjects and, quote, cast out the many who fail to do so.

First of all, the pessimism in that statement is monumental. I think American children can learn math calculations and do learn them every day. But what he is fundamentally saying is that because some children may not master the multiplication tables, the division tables, may not be able to do a complicated division problem or a complicated multiplication problem, they will feel bad. And we do not want them to feel bad so we should not give them a test that requires them to master those skills.

That is in the national math test which the Clinton administration has written and which will be imposed on America if the Congress does not stop it. It needs to do that next week, and we need, really, the help of our friends in the U.S. Senate; 295 of our colleagues in the House here voted to block national testing as proposed by Bill Clinton. Unfortunately, the House wants to compromise on this issue and let a committee be appointed to write a single national test.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I am not sure the House wants to compromise. I think the Senate maybe wants to compromise. I think my friend from California has something to say on this issue.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Not specifically on this issue. You can see on education, when we had the hearings in the 104th, we had eight of them, and the main concern from industry, small business, unions and major business was that children coming out of our school systems could not qualify for an entry level job because they could not read, they could not write, they did not have the math skills. They did not have the high technology or they could not speak the English language.

We are last, of the 15 industrialized nations, on all core courses. That is a legacy we have been left from a liberal education system. Not only cutting it, but the money that we get there, the teachers are not paid properly. My wife has a doctorate degree in education. She has a master's in education. She

has a master's in business. She is bilingual in Spanish. Her sister is in public education, special education program. So I know there are good programs and good teachers out there.

But what do we want to do? Because, A, there is less than 12 percent of the classrooms have even a single phone jack to upgrade them for the 21st century. They are operating in the 1950s. And even the good skilled schools do not have the computer facilities to help the kids to learn, to get ready for jobs. What I would say, and I would like to go through just a few of these, it will take me one minute, no more.

Number one, we have mentioned, to review the 760 programs. Number two, drive 90 percent of the money down to the classroom. A State bureaucracy is just as bad as a Federal bureaucracy. We want to give flexibility. I do not think we ought to tax work. We ought to tax savings, but tax consumption, different issue. But at least we ought to be able to give someone that wants to save for education not to have to pay tax on that for their children. That is an investment. We do think that.

Welfare reform, I think that is going to help. Every child should be able to read the English language by the third grade. There is no such thing as bilingual education. There are over 360 different languages out there. But every child by the third grade should be able to read in the English language and to be able to speak it.

I would say that we ought to incentivize. Of all the good schools that we do have out there, I would ask the gentleman, would you send your children to the worst? No. You would not. And we would say that the people that are trapped in that system want the same right that you do, that I do, that the President has. If their children are in a crime-ridden, drug-infested school or the teachers cannot even read their own readers, in some cases that has happened, it exists today, then that parent should be able to choose, with parental choice, where that child goes to school.

These are just a few of the initiatives that we think that we are being prohibited because of the unions. When the gentleman made a statement the other day about the unions, I happened to agree with you. If you look at Karl Marx' Communist manifesto and take a look at where the folks that want all the power to reside in the government, whether it is health care, whether it is education or whatever it is, in that manifesto it talks about the establishment of unions that will support the government because government will have the power.

If you look at the union bosses, and I say that because 30 percent of the unions are Republicans, 10 percent are independents, but yet the union bosses, like the Communist manifesto, want all the power in Washington so that they will have power. That is what is inhibiting us from going. I happen to agree with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to reinforce a couple things. The gentleman has brought up the term 760. Where does 760 come from? What we did, as part of the crossroads hearings, we went around the country, and we also asked the question in Washington, as to how many education programs are there. We went to OMB. We went to a couple of different places in the executive branch, and they came back and said, there are roughly 760 programs.

□ 2045

We said, that is interesting, that sounds like a lot. We asked for these programs typically to move the money from Washington back to the State, what kind of process does it have to go through. 487 steps. No wonder we lose 40 to 50 cents. No wonder 40 to 50 cents of every education dollar that comes from Colorado, for every dollar that comes, only 50 cents makes it back to Fort Collins. I do not think that is good enough for Colorado. I think the people in Colorado at the local level, those parents and those teachers know how to improve their schools better than somebody from Washington who has never been in Colorado.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I try to characterize my education goals and those of the Republican Congress in the following ways. First, we focus on treating parents like real customers. Secondly, we focus on treating teachers like real professionals. The third thing we talk about is the liberty to learn. And then fourth, the freedom to teach. Let me talk about the one we are addressing at the moment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield for just a second, some people might call that radical, is that correct?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I have been accused of that on occasion. I refer to that as the empire striking back.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Think of that. Empowering parents and teachers and all of that, some people in this Washington establishment down the road believe that that is a radical idea.

Mr. SHADEGG. Taking this one step further, they accuse us, those who support nationalized testing and support really federalizing this whole issue say that we are anti-education because we support empowering teachers. They say we are anti-education because we support empowering parents. They say we are anti-education because we support empowering local school boards and local schools to do what they know how to do best. That makes us anti-education? It is mind-boggling.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. He has got some great ideas on what to do on education, yielding back to our friend from Colorado.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. The gentleman is precisely right when he stated before that in Colorado, as in any State, that it is the local teachers,

the local principals, the local school board members and state legislators and parents, I do not want to leave out parents certainly, but those are the individuals that have the best ideas on what kind of reform needs to take place in order to improve the quality of education for their children.

National testing really places a damper on education improvement. I will tell my colleagues why. It goes back to the comment I made earlier about allowing the government to take over the role of defining quality. When we talk about liberty to learn as a Republican majority in Congress and our approach to reforming schools, what we are really speaking about is creating an education marketplace where intellectual ideas are free to be used and picked up or left behind by those who have different ideas about which educational setting is in the best interests of their children. When we talk about the exchange of ideas, when we talk about the creation of economic opportunity through learning, in an education marketplace it means that you or I as parents have the opportunity to pick the school that best meets the needs of our child.

That really is at the heart of every initiative that we have discussed on this floor over the course of the last 3 weeks when it comes to improving the quality of schools. Liberating parents, liberating teachers, liberating States to pursue education excellence on their terms. What happens when we give the government the authority to define quality is you really do constrain the ability of the customers to define quality. If we look to any other industry in America, all of the great industries that we have that are the best in the world, they are so because of competitiveness. They are so because of a marketplace that they compete in. They compete to do the best, to offer the greatest quality, the greatest amount of convenience and the lowest cost.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. For those companies, who defines excellence?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. It is the customer. It is the customer.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Who do we want to have in education define excellence?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. We want the parents, the customers, to define the quality. There are national tests, we mentioned before. The Clinton administration wants the government to establish a national test that will define quality. But I would submit that there are indicators upon indicators that tell you whether your local school district is succeeding or failing. If you look at things like the graduation rate, the dropout rate, if you look at things like the placement rate of students who graduate and go on to become gainfully employed or pursue higher education or serve in our armed services, whatever the case is, you have a whole battery of independent national tests. You have State tests that compare district to district and so on. All of those independent indicators are

the kinds of places that parents look to define quality. I want to give one specific example in my district. I raise this example because those who oppose parental choice in education, treating parents like customers, frequently say that if you really let parents choose which school to send their children to, that the public schools will somehow fail to meet the test and stay in the arena.

I refute that idea and offer the following example. A very good friend of mine, Anita Greeb in Fort Collins, Colorado recently wrote a letter to the editor in the local Fort Collins newspaper. What she discussed was her choice to move her child to 3 different education settings in my school district in my community. She was dissatisfied with school A, the first school. She moved her child to a charter school, a charter school that I helped create. She decided she was not satisfied with the quality of education in the classroom that her child was a part of and she moved her child to a third school, school C, a traditional public school setting with the teacher devoted to meeting the demands of that particular parent. My point again being this: School choice does a couple of things. It allows a parent to play a meaningful role in picking the right place for their child. That parent who cares about her child in this case, more than anybody else. She chose a traditional K-12 public school setting, the very kind of setting that many people believe will go away if we allow school choice. The second thing, though, that it does is it resulted in a lengthy letter to the local newspaper where she named names, she named the specific schools, she gave the specific reasons why she was dissatisfied with the first two options and the specific reasons why she gravitated toward the third.

When we have parents in communities being vocal about defining quality in their neighborhoods, we have won the battle. That is the goal of public school choice, parental choice, allowing parents to define the terms of quality on their terms in a persuasive, meaningful way rather than turning that authority over here to Bill Clinton and the U.S. Department of Education. That is the core element of this debate on national testing, whether we allow Anita Greeb out in Fort COLLINS, Colorado to define quality for her and her child or whether we take that authority from her, confiscate that authority from her and give it to the Clinton White House and to the U.S. Department of Education so far removed from the home and the child and the school district that Anita cares so much about out in our community.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. That is really what we have found as we have gone around the country, is that when you empower parents, you have parents defining quality. The other thing that happens, it is kind of interesting, it happens in the private sector as well. When customers are defining quality, the people

that are manufacturing or producing the product pay more attention to the customer and involve the customer in the process. What we find is that when you empower parents, you empower them in a number of ways, to choose, but also what you find out is that it fosters an environment that empowers parents and teachers and administrators to come together and to get a more common vision for their school and identify the school's role, the teacher's role and the parent's role. You actually get a consensus of where you want to go. The empowerment of parents, I think we saw that in Phoenix when we were there, we have seen the same development in California with charter schools. We are seeing it in Michigan with more public school choice. The atmosphere I think raises all of the schools up, traditional public schools. I have got a great example of a public school that is performing, I have got a lot of them in my district but one is kind of personal to me. They did very well in the State Science Olympiad. Some of you may remember at one time I had more hair on my face than I did on my head but they did very well in the State Science Olympiad. It is a traditional public school. I met with them, we kind of celebrated their success at the State Science Olympiad and I told them that you are going to go to the National Science Olympiad, they were smarter than I was because they are competing against 6,000 schools on a nationwide basis, that if you win the National Science Olympiad, you can shave off my beard.

Obviously, they won the National Science Olympiad and so we can have excellence in all different formats of schools. We are not saying charters. A lot of the stuff that we are seeing a lot of States experimenting, vouchers, charters, tax credits. There is not a silver bullet, one answer. There are lots of things that we can do and that is empowering parents, dollars in the classroom, basic academics. The more we move in that direction, the better off we are going to be.

Mr. SHADEGG. I think the gentleman is right. There is clearly not a single bullet but we have ascertained some basic facts. One of those is that the more parental involvement you have, the better the school. The more you empower parents, the more you empower the teachers and the administrators at that school to control that school and to seize its direction, the better an education we produce.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We saw that in Arizona when we went to, I do not remember the name of the school but we went to one of the gentleman's charter schools, we have seen it in the public schools as we have gone around, in all the different kinds of schools, the schools that are doing well, you go into the school and you go into the classroom and you can feel an energy. Parents are there. They are at our hearings, they are asking questions, they

are contributing, the teachers are there, the kids are pumped, the administrators, but the thing that they all have in common, they feel ownership of that school. They are proud of it.

Mr. SHADEGG. That is why I think that America would be in open revolt. There would be an outcry across this country if people understood that that kind of parental control of their local school was about to be stolen away by a one-size-fits-all Washington, D.C. written national test. I want to make a couple of quick points. I pointed out that this education consultant was a part of a group called the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and that he wrote it is downright dangerous to teach kids math calculations. There are a couple of quotes that I want to read from him to show how radical the people who will influence this test are.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Explain this. This is the guy that was part of the group that developed what may or may not be a national test, correct?

Mr. SHADEGG. He is listed in this book as one of the experts who helped write the test which the Clinton administration will begin to implement next year in America if it can or the year after that if the Congress does not block them.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Has the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, had more involvement in that test than the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. SHADEGG, is talking about?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. I have far less.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Has the gentleman from California Mr. CUNNINGHAM?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Let me give another classic example of where the Federal Government can run amok in writing standards or tests. The ranking minority member, he was my chairman when the Democrats were in the majority and then he became my ranking member when I was chairman of the committee when we took over in 1994 the majority. But he was outraged as a history teacher for the Federal Government producing history standards that spoke more on Madonna than they did the Magna Carta. They demonized veterans and liberalized hippies and liberals in different fields. They demonized in another area the Enola Gay which is right up here in a museum, they demonized American veterans and our military and wanted to apologize to Japan which caused many, many deaths. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, got that particular individual fired. But when the government takes over, they want their liberal agenda to fit into these exams. That is the whole difference. We want to empower the parents, the teachers, the local communities and the families to empower them to establish what is important to them, not some liberal bureaucrat here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The real difference here is when you empower local communities and parents, the standards re-

flect community standards. When you empower bureaucrats here in Washington, you get an agenda from Washington that they are trying to impose on communities around the country. It is bottom up versus top down. We are in favor of bottom up.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If I could just finish this one thought, that recently, this month, they did an exam, international exam. The United States was 28th in math skills, internationally, that we score 15 of 15 industrialized nations in almost all core courses. So is there an emergency? Yes. We want more than 50 cents on a dollar down to the classroom. We want local parents and teachers to take care and support, we want the dollars to upgrade the classroom instead of bureaucracies back here. So that everything we are talking about, the other side demonizes as radical. It is not radical to empower people. What is radical under a socialist communist government is to take that power away from the people and put it in the hands of the government alone.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We do not want to lose one child. We want to give every child the opportunity to develop their full skills.

Mr. SHADEGG. The gentleman makes an excellent point. That is, that just a few years ago, we witnessed an attempt by the Federal Government to impose national standards for education. Only we discovered that their standards taught that our veterans were evil, their history standards taught that great leaders like ABRAHAM Lincoln and George Washington were in fact evil. So the President in this latest effort to nationalize education has said, well, we will not do subjective topics like history or social studies, we will do objective, that is, those subjects we can all agree, objective subjects like mathematics.

□ 2100

Except that we discover that it is not objective, because, and there are really two points I want to make here, one is it is not objective because you and I and all Americans, I think, would agree that we ought to teach children that 6 times 7 is 42, but this test has been taken over by people that believe it is, and I quoted earlier, downright dangerous to teach children that 6 times 7 is 42. So they are radicalizing even an objective subject like math.

I want to read you one or more of these quotes in a few minutes here. One quick quote from Mr. Leinwand, this education expert. "But none of these larger social issues," he writes, "is as compelling as what we know about the sense of failure and pain unnecessarily imposed on hundreds of thousands of students in the name of mastering these obsolete procedures."

The obsolete procedures he is talking about are computational math skills. He goes on and writes, "A few short years ago, we had no alternative to pencil and paper computation. A few

short years ago we could even justify the pain and frustration we witnessed in our classrooms as necessary parts of learning what were then important skills. Today there are alternatives. There is no honest way to justify, he writes, no honest way to justify the psychic toll it takes to teach children to do calculations that involve simple math, that is, multiplication and division." "That," he says, "imposes a psychic toll and we shouldn't do it."

I suggest in Japan and Germany, and elsewhere around the world, with whom our children in the next generation will have to compete, they are drilling their children on those same basic computational skills.

The other point is we are going to move away from them if we adopt a national test, if we do not block it next week and get the help of the United States Senate in blocking the President next week.

But I want to make one other point. You asked my colleague from Colorado what input he had had on the test, and he said none. I have had no input on the test, and you have had no input on the test. But, more importantly, the parents and the teachers and the administrators and even the students in the schools in my neighborhood or your neighborhood or their neighborhoods across America have not had any input.

I want to talk about one gentleman that had some input. I mentioned the test was written as Mathematics Committee Recommendations to the National Test Panel. There is a national test panel.

One gentleman on that panel, Alan Wurtzel, wrote a letter of objection. He said wait. This test is a mistake. This test does not test basic math skills. He dissented, and he wrote, quoting from his letter of September 25th, "The test assumes that by the 8th grade, children can do basic arithmetic, including addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of whole numbers, decimals, and common fractions by hand."

This is the guy they got to write the test. He had input. He goes on to say, "The problem is that this assumption is all too often unjustified." Then he goes on and writes about a personal experience where he was talking to the others on the panel that wrote the test.

"As I told the panel, we used to test cashiers at Circuit City to determine if they could calculate the change due on a sale. So many were unable to do so, that we gave up."

He goes on and writes, "We have got to include in this test basic math skills." He is pleading as one of the panel members to include in the test basic math skills, and his ideas have been rejected.

A single test written in Washington will not include the views of the parents and teachers in our schools, and, for that reason, it will nationalize the curriculum and leave America's education behind the rest of the world.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, one of the places we have

had hearings this past year is we had hearings in the State of Delaware. Delaware is the size of one Congressional district. We have 16 in Michigan, 54 in California, or whatever it is, or 52.

But in Delaware, the State of Delaware, they wanted to develop a state-wide test, and they used the right process. They started with parents, teachers, local administrators, and it took them three years. They are now to the point where they believe they have a test that is testing the kind of skills that they believe need to be tested.

They have got parental input. What happens when you take a test? They get a score. Who finds out about the score? The kids and parents. What happens if the test is not validated with the parents? They say this test is all wrong, and you end up wasting it.

These guys here in the administration developed a national test with no involvement. They sat in an ivory tower somewhere and developed it in what, six or seven months, and they think they are going to apply it to Arizona, California, Michigan, New York, and what do you think the people in Colorado are going to say?

Mr. SCHAEFER. They will reject it, certainly, because it stands in the way of the local efforts that we have made to establish quality on local terms.

If I can, let me jump for a moment to the bureaucrats who write these tests that we are talking about, the national tests. What they understand is that conflict and controversy within their ranks does not compel public cash. It does not secure the taxpayers' cash for their efforts.

If they can come to the White House, to the President, with a package they have all agreed on in their closed rooms and secret little settings, and come to the White House and say, you know, all of us bureaucrats agree on this particular test, they get the Clinton Administration and the U.S. Department of Education to back them and to move boldly ahead in trying to secure the public money necessary to move these ideas forward.

That is what you see here. That is why a singular idea with this goofy notion on math, for example, that you should not challenge children to do simple computations, that is how a goofy idea like that is able to move forward in the Clinton Administration, because bureaucrats understand if you challenge another bureaucrat, if you embarrass a bureaucratic colleague, that the money goes away, that the American taxpayers lose confidence, they will not spend their cash on those kind of experiments with our children.

So they hide and they mask and they disguise the shortcomings of a Federal Government-owned test in the way that the gentleman from Arizona just described.

Again, it is precisely the reason when we talk about free markets in education, talk about treating parents like real customers, the empire is threatened, and the empire does strike back

and begins to characterize us as somehow anti-child and anti-education and so on.

The reality is the greatest hope for improving the quality of education and academic performance for our children is not to give the bureaucrats that the gentleman from Arizona described authority. It is not to make the notion of, what was that, the psychic toll, this notion that you present a psychic toll to children when you ask them to add and subtract, we should not give those kinds of folks more authority and more taxpayer dollars.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman will yield briefly, my concern here is that we are literally within days, as early as Tuesday of next week, this issue will be decided, and right now we have a fight going on between the U.S. House and the U.S. Senate where the U.S. House has said, no, do not steal local control of education away from our neighborhoods and give it to bureaucrats in Washington, and the Senate is caving in.

I am impassioned in my belief we have to fight this fight and win this fight. Senator ASHCROFT over on the other side is battling his colleagues. We are in grave danger of having a national test imposed by the Clinton Administration, written by these people, and I don't care how good the test is, one test will not work. We need to let parents in America write tests in their neighborhoods.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Any caring parent who understands what the Clinton Administration is trying to accomplish with these tests ought to be suffering a psychic toll of their own.

Mr. SHADEGG. I hope they will plead with their U.S. Senator to get into this fight.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think it is very interesting. I have learned a new term tonight. Instead of talking about stress or anxiety or whatever, psychic toll, only somebody who would be developing a national test could come up with psychic toll. I think it is about time we create some psychic toll on the other body before we end up really creating, we are going to have a test that does not work, and it will create a lot of stress and anxiety and a lot of wasted effort at the local level, because one more time, it is going to move more power away from that classroom to bureaucrats in Washington.

The leverage point is the classroom, with the teacher that knows my kid's name. That is where the money needs to go, where the decision making needs to go, and we have got to get it there and move it away from Washington, and we need to move to my colleague from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Who has been patiently standing by. I don't know of my colleagues, how many of you, it is difficult to pass a school bond even on a local district. In California it takes like two-thirds to pass a proposition. It has been very difficult. And if we get

less than 50 cents on a dollar down to the classroom, where are we going to get the money to upgrade those schools?

First of all, when you ask the public, more than a majority of the public feels that the education system, even though we have good schools, the majority feels that our public education system does not even rate a C grade. If that is the case, I would ask most of the majority to expect our schools to have nothing less than an A grade in what it teaches our children.

Remember a gentleman named Jaime Escalante, I mentioned his name once before? They thought he was radical when he thought he could teach children mathematics; it was calculus. And the teachers thought he was crazy. This was in a minority district, gang-infested, where the kids were low achievers, high risk.

I would say that the parents thought he was crazy; the teachers thought he was crazy. He got no support from the administration, and he said I am going to teach those kids. And he set out to do that as an individual. What a difference he made. Ninety-seven percent of the kids went on to college in mathematics. Then he got the support of the teachers. He got the support of the students. He got the support of the administrators, and made a difference.

I think when we turn this around that we get the support of people to say, listen, if we invest our dollars into education and there is a tangible result from that, that is going to make my child's life better, I am willing to give more. Part of that is giving them the tax dollars back to their pocket instead of the Federal Government. But I would say one of the ways we found out besides just the Federal dollar, the State dollar, is the 21st Century bill that my colleagues supported, goes in and lets private enterprise invest into high-tech systems into the classroom. They get to write off, say a computer that is less than 2 years old.

We have a nonprofit organization called the Detweiler Foundation that when you take that computer, the school cannot use it, they upgrade that computer with software and hardware. Guess what? They use prison labor and they use military brig labor. It gives them a skill so maybe they are not going to end up back there.

Then they turn around and give that computer, ready to use, to the school. We are putting California schools on an 18-month cycle so that we can upgrade and keep those schools up to speed. There is much more that needs to be done.

Libraries, I think, should be, because we are asking people to come off welfare, they have to have a place to access modern technology so that they can upgrade their skills.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. You would love the story that our colleague from Arizona and I can share with you about the student at the charter school who was, I think, in his previous school had been

labeled as a difficult student or whatever.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I got one of those, and he is doing great in charter school.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. This kid was put into this environment where he was provided an opportunity to flourish. You know what his strength was? He developed a whole bunch of strengths. Do you know one of the things he is really contributing to the school is—

Mr. SHADEGG. Rebuilding computers.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Rebuilding computers. They do not need a corporation to rebuild the computer and give it to the school. This kid, they give him, people drop stuff off and they give it to him and he fixes the stuff and he is a great student now.

Mr. SHADEGG. He was flunking out and he is borderline genius in repairing and putting computers back together.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think he is a great student now and he is contributing in a very different way to this school. So everything is kind of coming together because we have that student in the right environment.

□ 2115

It does not mean that the other school was a bad school, but we match the student with the environment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Would the gentleman agree, though, that nationally we have a system where computers are given to the schools, and they are ending up in a corner because they do not have the technology to upgrade? This is fantastic.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Absolutely. I am just trying to reinforce the point that we need to get the computers and technology in there. When it happens, the gentleman and I need somebody to fix our computers for us, and those kinds of things. These kids out there that are growing up with it, they can do wonderful things, the more technology we give them.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Think what we can do if we get 90 percent of the Federal dollars there, eliminate bureaucracy, and get private investment into our schools. That is a vision for the future of education.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Remember what this means. If we get 90 percent of the dollars to the local school district, instead of 50, that is about a 40 percent operating increase in local budget for every school district, without any new millage. It just says, you know, we have cut this money out and you are getting it, with no red tape.

So I thank my colleagues for joining me in this special order. We have had a wonderful discussion and dialogue on education. The important thing, as my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] keeps coming back to, we are going to be making a decision on this testing issue, which is a much bigger issue than testing. It is about who is controlling education, who is controlling curriculum, and who is con-

trolling dollars and direction for our local schools.

The House is firmly on record saying it has got to be parents, teachers, and local school boards. The other body is moving in the direction of Washington maybe knows best. That is the wrong direction to go.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I think the gentleman's crossroads program is one of the most important programs we are working on in Congress.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleagues for joining me.

AMERICA IS FACING A CRITICAL DECISION ON EDUCATION

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate, for those who may be listening at this point, we are on the verge of a very, very critical decision in this country. I hope people understand how important it is.

As Americans, we care about our children's education. We want them to do the best they can, and in this global economy in which they must compete, we want them to be able to compete with children around the world. That is why we embrace almost any idea to improve education, including ideas that are being thrown around nationally. But one of those ideas, while it sounds good, is, I believe, a grave threat to our children and to education in America, and to their ability to compete. That idea is national testing.

People tuning in or just listening might say, what is wrong with national testing? What is wrong with being able to allow parents in Arizona to compare the performance of their children and their schools with parents in Michigan or Florida? The truth is, there is nothing wrong with that, but there are tests to do that right now, independently written tests, like the Iowa test of basic skills, or the Stanford test. We have those tests.

What is being proposed today, and what energizes me and causes me fear, is a single exam written in Washington, DC, deep in the bowels of the Federal Department of Education or written by a committee appointed by the President, to be administered to every student in America. That one exam will have the danger of setting the national curriculum, and taking control away from parents and teachers and local administrators in my school district and in every American school district.

I think Americans trust the teachers and the administrators, and even the parents and the students in their own school district. They know if they want to influence the curriculum at their school, they can go to their school and make their voice heard. They can go to their local school board and make their voice heard.

But let me warn the Members, if we adopt one national test in reading for