

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 apartheid 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 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's 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

tighter restrictions than the product in which they are included. This bill stipulates that no part will face tighter restrictions than the device for which it is manufactured.

Mr. Speaker, our export control system needs direction and vision. It is my hope that the legislation I have introduced today will go a long way toward reforming this system, and end the current practice of tying the hands of America's best competitors.

FAIRNESS FOR THE WIDOWS OF
OUR MILITARY RETIREES

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Military Survivors Equity Act of 1995.

I would like to tell you a story, a story with an unhappy ending. A resident of my congressional district, when he retired from his service in the Armed Forces of our country, decided to have a portion of his monthly retired pay withheld in order to pay for benefits for his wife in case he died.

Unfortunately, he died an untimely death, and his wife began to receive a monthly death benefit. The amount she received was 55 percent of her husband's retired pay.

Imagine her astonishment when she turned 62 and found that the amount of her benefit was reduced to 35 percent of her husband's retired pay. When she inquired as to the reason, she was told that because she was eligible to get Social Security, her survivor benefits were reduced.

"But my Social Security payment is based on my own work," she said. "Why is the pension that my husband paid for in any way connected to my Social Security?" The answer: because that's the law!

Well, I think it's time to change this law—a law which simply doesn't make sense. The Military Survivor Benefit Plan, called the SBP plan, is a good idea—but it is very complicated.

For some, SBP benefits are reduced or offset by the amount of the military retiree's Social Security when the survivor reaches age 62—regardless of when she actually begins to draw Social Security benefits.

For others, under the newer two-tier SBP plan, like the widow in my congressional district, the benefit is automatically reduced at age 62 to 35 percent of her husband's retired military pay—a reduction of over 1/3 from her previous benefits.

I believe it is time to get rid of these offsets. It is time to live up to the expectations of our military retirees, when they choose to provide for their widows after their deaths. It is time to simplify this incredibly complicated SBP system.

My bill will provide an SBP death benefit equal to 55 percent of the military retiree pay. Period. No offsets. No reductions. That is what our military retirees expected. That is what their widows expected. That is what we should deliver.

It is time to live up to our commitment to those who have served our Nation so honorably. It is time to correct the wrongs inflicted on their widows. It is time to restore honor to the Military Survivor Benefit Plan.

TRADE REORGANIZATION ACT OF
1995

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 1995 I was joined by seven of my colleagues in introducing the Trade Reorganization Act of 1995, HR. 2124. The purpose of this bill is to consolidate the functions of the U.S. Trade Representative's Office with the trade functions of the Commerce Department into one U.S. Trade Office. The cosponsors of the bill realize that all of these trade functions are critical to enhancing U.S. exports and creating jobs. A legislative drafting error resulted in the appearance that our bill only transferred the foreign component of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service. I want the record to reflect that it was the intent of all the sponsors of the bill to preserve the domestic offices and include those operations in the U.S. Trade Office.

ELIZABETH ADKINS AMONG VFW
VOICE OF DEMOCRACY NA-
TIONAL SCHOLARSHIP WINNERS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 4, 1995

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a remarkable member of my district, Elizabeth Adkins, the Illinois winner of the 1995 Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. Each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary sponsors the competition, choosing winners from over 126,000 scripts submitted by high school students around the nation. Elizabeth, a recent graduate of Wheaton North High School, received top honors in Illinois for her speech entitled "My Vision for America". I am proud to recognize this bright young author as well as the thousands of patriotic students who participated in the contest.

"MY VISION FOR AMERICA"

America has, since its conception, been the embodiment of democratic and moralistic ideals. As a nation we defend again and again the principles that we are built upon. Freedom, equality, justice, and opportunity. We struggle together over where the line is crossed between national morals and narrow-minded policies, between equality and reverse-discrimination, between personal choice and the rights of an unborn child. But only in America could these struggles strengthen a country. Only in America could citizens dare to disagree with their government. Only in America could political leaders and parties change every four or eight years and not cause a complete collapse of the nation. And so, in asking what my vision for America is, I cannot say a New America or a different America. For I do not want to abandon the America of today or forget the America of yesterday.

I do believe, however, that this nation can and will be improved. I see a need in America. And I believe that this need has been growing for the last thirty years. Each American citizen must begin to take some responsibility. Responsibility for his or her own actions, mistakes, and well-being. Re-

sponsibility for those less fortunate who do not have the ability to care for themselves. And responsibility for what this nation does. A devoted citizen would not disown their country every time it made a mistake, or didn't have enough money, or lost one battle or another. As devoted citizens, we Americans must stand behind this country, improving it when we can and fighting for it when we must.

The major problems of the United States would be alleviated if citizens took initiative and were willing to bear the burdens that citizens of a powerful democratic nation must bear. In the America of tomorrow, each citizen will have rediscovered their moral basis and built a motivational basis. A strong moral basis will help to alleviate the crime problem. Children who are taught simply what is right and wrong and who are challenged and encouraged to do what is right will be more equipped to lead lives void of crime. Perhaps what this country needs are a few reminders from the America of yesterday. Maybe we need to hear a few more stories where good battles evil and the good guy wins. In the America of tomorrow there is only one winner in the fight between right and wrong. Americans must begin to develop moral responsibility.

And it isn't just about doing what is right anymore. America needs to advance beyond doing what is right to doing what is best. Is it enough to simply take care of your family? What about helping your neighbors or your community? American citizens need to be responsible for fellow American citizens. My vision for America returns to neighborhood groups and local organizations that are trying to make some improvements. When citizens begin to take actions to assist their neighbors as well as themselves, vivid changes will take place. When citizens learn to give of themselves for someone else, materialism and special interests will vanish. When Americans develop a responsibility for their neighbors and their communities, they will be able to look forward as a unified nation to improving this country as a whole.

My vision of America is that each man and woman will understand the need to pull together as a nation and to pull oneself together as an individual citizen. In this America, the word duty will have the resonance that it once did. Each American has a duty, and that duty is what makes a democracy work. In order for America to maintain those freedoms and liberties which we all cherish, we must fulfill our duties and responsibilities to ourselves, our neighbors, and our nation.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT
FINANCING, AND RELATED PRO-
GRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT,
1996

SPEECH OF

HON. FRED HEINEMAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 11, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate and studied the details in this bill. The Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill reduces spending by \$9 billion from last year and reduces or eliminates many effective, wasteful or duplicative programs. This