

A FREE PASS IN RUSSIA—NOT YET!

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a story for any of my esteemed colleagues who think that the press in Russia is truly free.

Early this month NTV, the largest privately owned TV network in Russia aired a puppet show that took a few satirical swipes at the Russian government. Very light stuff compared to what you might see on Saturday Night Live. The prosecutor-general's office, upon learning that the honor and dignity of the Russian leadership had been made light of, swung into action, filing suit against the producers of the show and launching a full-blown criminal investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's quite ironic that the Russian government, which has thus far proven incapable of catching the killers of two leading journalists, is turning its massive resources to bear on a bunch of rubber puppets. Public figures have to face up to a certain amount of lampooning, and a little political humor is no excuse for this kind of bullying by the Russian government.

TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF COMMERCE RONALD H. BROWN

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, As we prepare to return to our districts where many of us will be meeting with community and business leaders concerned about economic development opportunities in our neighborhoods, I want to use this occasion to salute the outstanding accomplishments of a gentleman who has worked tirelessly to promote the cause of business and economic opportunity throughout the United States and abroad. The Honorable Ronald H. Brown, our distinguished commerce secretary, is to be applauded and commended for the outstanding job that he has done in serving as the administration's enormously adept "Pied Piper" of economic opportunity and empowerment.

Ron Brown is the 30th United States Secretary of Commerce. In nominating him to this auspicious post, President Bill Clinton noted that "American business will know that the Department of Commerce has a strong and independent leader and a forceful advocate." Those of us who have been privileged to know Ron can attest to his outstanding leadership acumen and his tenacity and considerable powers of persuasion. His is a skillful negotiator and an indefatigable advocate on behalf of America's economic interests abroad as he seeks to expand and open markets for American made products around the globe.

Ron's career has been structured around public service and helping to make America a better place for all of her citizens. A native Washingtonian, he grew up in New York where his parents managed Harlem's famous St. Theresa's Hotel. He attended Middlebury College in Vermont and received his law de-

gree from St. John's University. He is a member of the New York Bar, the District of Columbia Bar, and is admitted to practice before the United States Supreme Court.

A veteran of the United States Army, Ron saw tours of duty in Germany and Korea.

Secretary Brown has had an eclectic career. He spent 12 years with the National Urban League, serving as Deputy Executive Director, and General Counsel and Vice President for the organization's Washington operations. He also served as Chief Counsel for the Senate Judiciary Committee. He is a former partner in the Washington, DC law firm of Patton, Boggs, and Blow. And who among us does not remember the brilliant job that he did as the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee and 1993 Inaugural Committee.

As Secretary of Commerce, Ron has travelled extensively, promoting the administration's trade policies and forging sound private/public sector partnerships. Following the Los Angeles, Northridge earthquake in January 1994, Ron was one of the first cabinet officials on the scene, working with local, state, and federal officials to identify and earmark funding sources for businesses severely damaged and/or destroyed in the quake. He has since returned to the quake damaged areas on several occasions to survey the progress made by programs implemented under this aegis.

Ron maintains a schedule that would tire men half of his age. Yet he is always prepared to go wherever he is needed, and he always does it with aplomb and with a spirit of unyielding optimism that inspires all around him to achieve the same level of commitment.

In addition to his weighty responsibilities as Commerce Secretary, Ron serves on several presidential boards and councils. He is a member of the President's National Economic Council, the Domestic Policy Council, and the Task Force on National Health Care Reform. He serves a Co-Chair of the U.S.-China Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade, the U.S.-Russia Business Development Committee, and the U.S.-Israel Science and Technology Commission.

Secretary Brown is also a member of the Board of Trustees for Middlebury College and is chair of the Senior Advisory Committee of the Institute of Politics at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to have this opportunity to commend my good friend Secretary Ronald H. Brown on the fine job that he is doing as our Secretary of Commerce. He has led an exemplary career, and I have no doubt that he will continue to lead and inspire. Please join me in applauding him on an outstanding career, and in extending to him, his wife Alma, and their two children, attorneys Michael and Tracy, continued success in the future.

H.R. 2127, A TRAGIC SETBACK FOR THIS NATION

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, last night's vote on H.R. 2127, the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill, represents a tragic setback for this Nation and

particularly for our young people. The cuts embodied in that legislation are a full-fledged assault on the prosperity of this Nation's next generation. Fortunately, the action of this House last night is far from the last skirmish in the battle for a solid commitment to educate America's young people.

Before my colleagues leave to return to their districts, I want to share with all of you a speech given this past Sunday by Louis V. Gerstner, Jr., chairman and CEO of the IBM Corp. which is headquartered in Westchester County, NY, parts of which I represent. His remarks were to the National Governors Association. They are, without a doubt, a call to arms in the pursuit to revolutionize and dramatically improve education in America.

I could not agree more with Mr. Gerstner's sense of urgency about the need for a true commitment to enhance education in America. He is right that much more clearly needs to be done. He hit the nail on the head when he said, "A true change agent puts their money where their mouth is." Unfortunately, last night's vote tells the American people that the House has made a decision not to be a partner in pursuing the changes in America's schools that we all know are needed.

Mr. Speaker, change is possible. I have seen the innovations that are occurring in schools in Westchester, the Bronx, and Queens. Over the years, I have been deeply involved in major education reform initiatives, including Goals 2000, title I reforms, and a newfound commitment to professional development and technology through the Eisenhower Professional Development Program and the Technology Learning Challenge.

Unfortunately, the bill passed last night makes precisely the wrong kinds of changes. It eliminates funding for Goals 2000, cuts funding for title I by 18 percent, and slashes the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program. This bill also undermines our commitment to preserving the American dream by cutting student financial assistance and higher education program.

As we head back to our districts, I urge my colleagues to reflect on Mr. Gerstner's message. I sincerely hope that, when we return to Washington in September, this body will do what is right for America's future and correct the serious mistakes included in the bill approved last night. When so much is at stake, this House should not abandon our bipartisan commitment to America's schools—and our children.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Gerstner's speech be included at this point in the RECORD.

REMARKS OF LOUIS V. GERSTNER, JR., CHAIRMAN AND CEO—IBM CORP. AT THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING

Thank you, Governor Dean. It's good to be back in Vermont.

In 1983, the report A Nation at Risk focused the country's attention on the deficiencies in our public school system. Here's a quote from that report that has stuck with me for many years: "If an unfriendly foreign power had imposed our schools upon us, we would have regarded it as an act of war."

That was 12 years ago. What's happened since? Lots of hand wringing, lots of speeches, lots of reports. Not much change—very little improvement. It's twelve years since A Nation at Risk was published, and U.S. students still finish at, or near, the bottom on international tests of math and science.

I wonder what the national reaction would have been if in the 1984 Olympic games we

had finished dead last. A national outrage, in all likelihood, that would have brought about sweeping changes in amateur athletics in this country. Believe me, by now, 11 years later, we would have seen massive improvements. But in public education? None—and no national outrage or frustration 12 years after A Nation at Risk.

Let's move from 1983 to the education summit in 1989 when, at a meeting similar to this, President Bush and the nation's governors set the wheels in motion for the Educate America Act: Goals 2000 that President Clinton helped shape and then signed in June of 1994. Let me read just a few of those goals we set for ourselves for the year 2000: All children in America will start school ready to learn; the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent; all students will leave grades four, eight and 12 having demonstrated competency in English, math, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, art, history and geography; every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning and productive employment in our nation's modern economy.

Six years have passed since those wonderful goals were set. More important, 1616 days remain until the year 2000 arrives. I wonder how many people in our country are committed to achieving those goals. I wonder how many people think we have a chance of achieving them. I often think how many people even know they exist.

One of the goals I just cited talks about graduation rates, and another the need for standards. I read recently that Milwaukee now has a requirement that high school seniors must demonstrate a proficiency in math before they are allowed to graduate. That is great. And we need more cities and states doing the same. But the same article I read reported that 79 percent of the junior class failed in a warm-up test this spring. That's dismal. And it's reflective of our country at large.

Now, that's not the whole story. The test consisted of complex, open-ended problems, which—for these kids—was a new approach to math. Exactly the right approach, of course. Exactly the direction we want to head in, and they'll have a full year to master it. But what happens then? What happens next year if a large percentage of the senior class fails to demonstrate the required proficiency? Will Milwaukee refuse to graduate those who fail? If they don't, so much for standards.

But it's not easy. What do we do about the students we've promoted for 13 years through the public school system without demanding high performance? How will they get the skills necessary to earn a living? And, of course, it is much worse than a single class of seniors. We have given high school diplomas in this country to a whole generation of Americans who cannot basically read those diplomas—they are functionally illiterate.

The bottom line is that if our kids are failing in the classroom, it's not just their fault. It's our fault. And that, my friends, underscores a very frightening reality. Setting goals for U.S. education is one thing. Reaching them is another. And the only way it will happen, the only way that we have even a ghost of a chance of getting there, is if we push through a fundamental, bone-jarring, full-fledged, 100 percent revolution that discards the old and replaces it with a totally new performance-driven system.

Which is what brings me to Vermont today. I'm here because of Willie Sutton. Willie robbed banks, the story goes, because he realized that's where the money is. I'm here because this is where the power is—the

power to reform—no, to revolutionize—the U.S. public school system.

You are the CEOs of the organizations that fund and oversee the country's public schools. That means you are responsible for their health. They are very sick at the moment. And we are past the time for incremental change and tinkering at the margin. Fortunately, we're not past the point of no return.

I've spent a lot of time of education. So have many of you. We all have scars to prove it.

But, I've also spent a lot of time helping troubled companies get back on their feet. It's hard work. Lots of hard work, and it invariably involves massive structural change.

But here's the good news. When companies do turn around, they often go on to bigger and better things.

I'm convinced that our public schools can do just that. We can win gold medals in the education Olympics. But it will take a world-class effort and it will only happen if you, the CEO's of the system, reached out, grab it by the throat, shake it up and insist that it happen.

The turnarounds we've seen in corporate America don't come close to the complexities of the job you face in fixing our public schools, but I believe the principles of structural revolution are the same: First, it takes a personal commitment on the part of the CEO. This is not a job you can delegate; second, it takes a willingness to confront and expel the people and the organizations that are throwing up roadblocks to the changes you consider critical; third, you need to set high expectations. You can't have too many goals. One or two are best. Certainly no more than three; fourth, it's critical to measure the progress against those goals—relentlessly and continuously; and finally, there must be a willingness on the part of the change agent to hold people accountable for results.

Nothing pleases me more than to see some of you moving in this direction in your state. You are responsible for some very bright spots in an overall dismal picture. But there aren't nearly enough.

So what do we do now? In the spirit of my views on how one goes about radical restructuring of institutions, I want to suggest three, and only three, priorities for public education for the next year:

The first is setting absolutely the highest academic standards and holding all of us accountable for results. Now, immediately. This school year. Now if we don't do that, we won't need any more goals, because we are going nowhere. Without standards and accountability, we have nothing.

But if we do have standards and accountability, I would suggest two other priorities that are critical to allow our institutions of education to reach those goals, and they are: Financing change and exploiting technology.

Let's talk very briefly about each. First, standards and accountability.

If we don't face up to the fact that we are the only major country in the world without an articulated set of education standards—and without a means of measuring how successfully we are reaching them, we're lost before we get started. Which pretty much sums up where we are today. To turn the tide, we must set standards. Immediately. And we must have a means of measuring how we are doing. Without standards, educational reform is shuffling deck chairs on the Titanic.

I have to confess I find the whole thing baffling. In virtually everything else we do in the United States, we set high standards and strive to be No. 1. Why not in education? In basketball, you score when the ball goes in the hoop, not if it hits the rim. In football,

you score when you cross the goal line, not when you show up in uniform. In track and field, you must jump over the bar, not go under it or around it. And who would practice baseball with the fences 150 feet from home plate?

Why can't we establish standards of excellence for our schools? Why isn't winning in the classroom important in America?

We put a man in space because we set a goal that was beyond—not within—our grasp. We need the same approach for education. And we must be relentless in its pursuit. The lessons we understand so well in every other aspect of our lives must be translated into education or else we will lose.

We cannot be side-tracked by academicians who say it will take five years just to set the standards. Nor can we be misled by misinformed people who will argue that certain Americans aren't able to reach high standards, so it's inappropriate to even set them. I find that insulting and demeaning to those people, not supportive.

It boils down to the fact that we can't just settle any more for mediocrity. We must commit to the highest levels of student achievement. And we must do it now. We can't allow our schools to simply sit back, complacently convinced that their only responsibility is to keep students at their desks until they are 18 years old.

They'll get to 18 fast enough and regardless of what we do. What they need from us are tools to help prepare them for success as they go off to college or work, raise families and join the adult community. This requires an articulated set of academic standards that recognizes the real world they'll be entering.

In many places, they don't even exist at a rudimentary level. Many states still require only two years of math and science for a high school diploma. Why? Math isn't something that students can finish in the tenth grade, and think they'll never need it again. And, if we are going to do this right, we must make sure our high school students take real math, academic math—not what the students call "dummy math." And they must take laboratory science, not general science.

We must find innovative ways to help students master these complex subjects, and we must hold schools accountable for what students learn. It's not enough to memorize facts and figures. Whether we're dealing with the requirements in the job market or skills needed to participate in society, the bar is higher * * *.

When the Labor Department recently asked businesses what they expected our schools to teach, the answer was clear—a foundation of reading, writing and arithmetic, combined with an ability to use information to solve problems and to communicate them effectively.

These are not esoteric or complex concepts. They are, however, for every one of these children, the difference between success or failure in their lives. We must find ways to teach them, to measure whether they have been taught and to reward teachers and administrators at schools where students succeed. And we must have serious sanctions for those at schools where students are not learning.

Obviously, Milwaukee will have a difficult choice to make next year because it's out in front. But the fact remains that until we are prepared to penalize students, and administrators for lack of performance, the system will fail. We have a word for that in business. Accountability. It works. Without it, institutions atrophy and die. Let's turn quickly to the second and third priorities beyond standards.

True accountability for performance will depend on exploiting technology and financing change in the system. You've all heard about information technology. Bear with me if this sounds a bit stuffy, but information technology is the fundamental underpinning of the science of structural reengineering. It is the force that revolutionizes business, streamlines government and enables instant communication and the exchange of information among people and institutions around the world.

But information technology has not made even its barest appearance in most public schools. Look around. The most visible forms of technology remain the unintelligible public address systems, which serve largely to interrupt the business of learning, and the copier in the principal's office, which spews out the forms and regulations that are the life blood of the education bureaucracy.

Before we can get the education revolution rolling, we need to recognize that our public schools are low-tech institutions in a high-tech society. The same changes that have brought cataclysmic change to every facet of business can improve the way we teach students and teachers. And it can also improve the efficiency and effectiveness of how we run our schools.

I'd like to make you a personal offer. I'd like to invite you, the governors, and your key people to a conference that I will organize and run next year. I'll get experts from all parts of our industry—including our competitors—to participate and, together, we will show you how technology created for business and government can be used to help re-shape the public schools of America.

We'll put it all together but we'll need your help. And you'll have to be there. You'll have to invest a day—not a few hours. Because, as I said before, real change requires the participation of the CEO. It will be worth it. I think you will be excited by the innovative things that are beginning to happen in some classrooms. And some of you are already moving in that direction.

Let's think about how technology is benefiting students right here in Vermont. For example, the portfolios used to measure student development are being taken out of manila folders and put on digital discs. This allows educators to make evaluations based on a student's entire output rather than on simple multiple-choice exams. Chicago is combining the power of telecommunications and the Internet to train teachers in math and science. Schools in Charlotte, North Carolina are using video technology to reach into the home. Philadelphia schools are using voice technology to teach language skills to learning-disabled students.

And outside the classroom, technology is cutting away at the school bureaucracy and dealing with routine matters like bus routing, meal deliveries and purchasing.

Which brings me to my third priority—financing change. It is my experience in business, and especially in turnaround situations, that if you want to bring about real change, budget allocations must support the new direction. Reforms perish from lack of support. And that means resources. A true change agent puts their money where their mouth is. The educational apparatchiks fight hard to starve the reformers.

So how do we finance the revolution? How do we use our education resources to reward success and encourage performance? Let's start with the \$150 billion or so that you, as the CEOs of our states, invest directly in the public school system. I've done some homework, so I know that a state's education budget is typically constructed by adding a percentage increase to the prior year's outlays. The basic formula—which many describe as arcane—is largely driven by the

number of pupils in the system, supports priorities set decades before, and rarely, if ever, is linked to performance, success or change.

Here's my proposal. Let's try something new. This year, instead of following the old formula, hold back ten cents of every dollar and earmark it for strategic investments. Where would we put this \$15 billion to work? If it were me, I'd invest a portion of it in moving teacher training out of the horse and buggy era. We expect doctors to get their training in teaching hospitals. We wouldn't send an NBA player on the court if his only training consisted of lectures on the theory of the jump shot, case studies of the fast break and films of games played years ago.

Why, then, do we entrust our children to teachers who have only listened to lectures, written essays on classroom management and read text books on the theory of child development? It's time teachers learned their craft in real schools side-by-side with expert teachers. It's time they got the kind of hands-on experience most other professions consider vital for certification.

If it were up to me, I'd invest some of that \$15 billion in reorganizing how our kids spend their time in school. In Japan, where the school year runs 240 days a year, the average 18-year-old has spent more cumulative time in school than the average American MBA.

And while I challenge you to find a teacher anywhere in this country who truly believes that every subject—or any subject, for that matter—is best taught in exactly 45 minutes, we still ring the bell at the end of each period, as though there was a natural order to it all! A science project may take a full six hours to complete. Other subjects may be best taught in 15-minute slots over a two-week period. The school day, week and year need to be re-shaped fundamentally to reflect reality.

There are hundreds of good ideas out there about how to use the \$15 billion. I know about them, so do you. Some of the most promising are emerging from the New American Schools Development Corporation which is funding development of breakthrough reforms across the country. All that's lacking is the courage to shift funding from the status quo that has failed unarguably, to the agenda of reform and hope for our children.

Obviously, my three suggestions are sure to generate howls of protest from the education establishment and from others who are happy with the status quo and are unwilling to change. They will say that setting standards is not possible in education. Or that setting high standards will only raise the dropout rate. Others will attack the focus on technology, maintaining it's a self-serving business scam or a vain grasp for a silver bullet that won't work.

Still others will attack the \$15 billion we're reallocating for strategic investments, saying it's just a gimmick, it won't work and it is really an approach to disguise cutting education budgets. I see it as just the opposite. Everyone in the education community talks reform and supports reform, but when push comes to shove, they back off and attribute the lack of progress to the lack of financial wherewithal.

Well, now we have it. Our \$15 billion fund will provide a way to kick-start a major effort for reform. And here's the real kicker, we're only going to give \$15 billion to the schools and systems that actually implement true reform.

TECHNOLOGY EXPORT REVIEW ACT

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce The Technology Export Review Act. This legislation is based largely on H.R. 3534, The Computer Equipment and Technology Export Control Reform Act, introduced last year by my good friend, Representative Don Edwards. I am proud to carry forward Mr. Edwards' work on this issue in the 104th Congress.

The Foreign Availability Act, and H.R. 3534 of last year, were both introduced to reform a Federal system that has gone amok. Currently, our Nation's interagency export control regime is overly bureaucratic, does not accurately take into account changes in technology or in the world marketplace, and puts too difficult a burden on the backs of our Nation's economically critical high technology companies.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. electronics and information technology industries employs 2.5 million Americans in secure, high paying jobs. But it is important to know that these companies, which are vital to America's economic future, depend on foreign sales. For example, the computer industry earns more than half of its sales overseas, and that number is growing. And, the U.S. semiconductor industry has recently reclaimed a dominant world market share for the first time in more than a decade. All of this means that where federal policies unnecessarily burden and delay foreign sales, American workers suffer. It is that simple.

Under the current export control system, certain technologies can be freely exported to most of the world, while others, usually the most advanced, must be given licenses on an individual case-by-case basis. Under this process, the determination of winners and losers is haphazard. There is no regular review of technological progress. There is no questioning of the purpose and the effect of the controls. There is no seeing the forest through the trees.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation requires an annual review of export controls on dual-use technology. The annual review must consider first, the objectives of such controls—what were they designed to accomplish and why specific product performance levels were set—and the extent to which such objectives have been met; second, the extent to which the products controlled are widely available from sources outside the United States; and third, the economic impact of such controls on U.S. industries.

Based on this review, the Secretary of Commerce would be required to increase the performance level thresholds at which technologies are controlled or otherwise modify controls in accordance with the findings. The legislation includes a general default provision that requires the Secretary to propose multilateral decontrol of all dual-use goods that reach mass-market status of 100,000 units installed for end-use outside of the United States over a 12-month period.

Finally this bill would make a common sense notion into law. Under the current system, individual components may be subject to