

| | | |
|-------------|-----------|------------|
| Watt (NC) | White | Wynn |
| Watts (OK) | Whitfield | Yates |
| Waxman | Wicker | Young (AK) |
| Weldon (PA) | Wise | Young (FL) |
| Wexler | Wolf | |
| Weygand | Woolsey | |

□ 1758

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2264) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEREUTER (Chairman pro tempore, in the chair).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, September 11, 1997, the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Hostettler] had been disposed of and section 515 was open for amendment.

Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

□ 1800

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to engage the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], my esteemed colleague and chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, in a colloquy.

On September 10, 1997, the Senate voted 91 to 8 to pass an amendment by Senator COVERDELL of Georgia to the Senate Labor Health and Human Services appropriations bill. This amendment included several proposals designed to help respond to the *E. coli* problems we as a nation have experienced recently.

This amendment addresses the *E. coli* issue head on by providing funding for research on the development of improved medical treatment for patients infected with this disease.

This amendment also provides funding to help detect and prevent colonization of *E. coli* in live cattle, and amongst other important provisions provides the implementation of a study on the feasibility of irradiating raw red meat to eliminate the *E. coli* and to develop a consumer education program on the process' safety.

I would strongly urge that Chairman PORTER look favorably upon this amendment when deliberations begin in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING], my colleague, for yielding.

I am aware of the amendment pertaining to *E. coli* that was accepted on the Senate bill. While I cannot agree with the amendment's approach of tapping funds already appropriated for other purposes instead of providing an offset to fund the *E. coli* initiative, I think we would all agree that the *E. coli* problem is a serious one. I would expect the House conferees to look favorably upon action to encourage the Department of Health and Human Services to undertake those activities

highlighted in the amendment which appropriately fall within the HHS mission.

In fact, the House bill already provides an increase for the Centers for Disease Control infectious diseases program to support the new food safety initiative.

Mr. EWING. I thank the chairman. I appreciate his interest and concern, and I hope that the conference committee will take this matter up.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore Mr. BEREUTER. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. GOODLING:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . (a) PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL TESTING IN READING AND MATHEMATICS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to develop, plan, implement, or administer any national testing program in reading or mathematics.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to the following:

(1) The National Assessment of Educational Progress carried out under sections 411 through 413 of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 9010-9012).

(2) The Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS).

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I have been rather disappointed on several occasions in the last couple weeks when it was mentioned by some that perhaps this was a political argument. I want to assure everyone this has nothing to do with politics whatsoever.

My concern and my interest comes from 22 years as an educator, 22 years as a teacher, a guidance counselor, a principal, a superintendent of schools, a supervisor of student teachers, a school board president, a PTA president. My concern is based simply on the fact that I believe I have learned a lot in those 22 years as to how children learn, why children do not learn, and what one does in order to have children learn. As a matter of fact, in March 1991 I wrote an op ed, and that was during President Bush's administration, in opposition to this very same issue.

We are told, first of all, that 17-year-olds in this country, some of the most recent statistics would indicate that 52 percent read fairly well, comprehend fairly well, and do math and science quite well. That means that the other 50 percent do poorly.

I would ask all of my colleagues who are here and all who may be listening to put themselves in the shoes of that other 50 percent, that 50 percent that has not done well and who are not doing well at the present time. This 50 percent has been tested with every standardized test there is, whether it is Iowa, whether it is California, Stanford. They have been tested with every

NOES—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—10

| | | |
|-------------|----------|-------------|
| Abercrombie | Gonzalez | Weldon (FL) |
| Brown (FL) | Metcalf | Weller |
| Ehlers | Neal | |
| Furse | Schiff | |

□ 1755

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read:

A bill to provide for the temporary extension of certain programs relating to public housing, to reauthorize certain programs relating to housing assistance, and to amend section 255 of the National Housing Act to prevent the funding of unnecessary or excessive costs for obtaining a home equity conversion mortgage, and for other purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MADAM SPEAKER

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity to wish the gentlewoman a very happy birthday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman from New Jersey and pretends that she is younger than she really is, or tries to be anyway.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2264) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2264.

State test. They have been tested with every district test, and they have been tested with every classroom test.

What have they been told after every one of those tests? The same thing: "You are not doing very well." What they do not want, what that 50 percent do not want at this time is to spend another \$100 million to test them one more time on a standardized test to tell them "You are not doing very well." They want to know what it is we are going to do to help them do better.

If someone is in the cattle business, they do not fatten cattle by constantly putting them on the scales and weighing them. We do not make a car run any faster by adding another speedometer. And we do not help those who are not doing well in education with one more standardized national test to tell them "You are doing poorly."

It was an interesting discussion recently in the other body when I testified before a Senate committee. The Secretary indicated that it is a tragedy that students do not have algebra and do not understand algebra by the time they get to 8th grade, and then a little later said, "and in our test we will test for algebra."

And one of the gentlemen from the other body said, "Mr. Secretary, I must have missed something. I thought you said they did not have any algebra by the time they got to the eighth grade."

"That is right."

"But then I thought I heard you say you are going to include in your test, algebra." Well, that does not make very much sense, does it?

First of all, as I have said so many times, if we want to move in that direction, then we sure better prepare those elementary teachers who have had very little math in college, have had very little math in high school, and all of a sudden we are going to ask them to teach algebra.

Let us take the other 50 percent. Let us shift the debate. Suppose we believe in a national test. We certainly would not go about it in a manner in which it was gone about this particular time. If we believe that there is some value in a national standardized test, the first thing we have to do is determine what is our purpose, and that purpose has to be very narrowly stated. We cannot have a valid test, all test experts will tell us, if we do not narrowly focus.

Well, what is the purpose of a test? I heard four, five, six different purposes, one of which, the Assistant Secretary said, "I am not happy with the curricula in this country, and we have to do something about that." That is an interesting statement. That should scare everybody, I think, because who is going to develop that curricula that he was talking about, since he does not like what is there at the present time? So we narrowly focus.

Another says, well, this is to judge one school against another school so that we know which schools are doing well, which are doing poorly. That is one of the worst statements I think

anyone could make, because now I am going to compare someone who has had no advantages whatsoever as far as preschool reading readiness is concerned, in a school where there are many students who fit that category, with a school where they have had all the advantages in preschool.

And so somehow or other with a national test, I am going to help that group that have not had those advantages, and then I can do a better job of comparing them with those who have had all the advantages. In my area, I would say we would not compare inner city Pittsburgh with upper St. Claire, which is an area outside of Pittsburgh.

So we say, okay, the purpose is curricula. Now we have to determine what it is we want to test. Now we are getting into some real serious difficulties, what we want to test.

Well, that means, and I am not up here arguing, and I do not want to get involved in this business of, "Yes, it will be a national curricula; no, it will not," but we have to determine what it is we are going to test. In order to do that, someone, someone or somebody has to determine what that curricula is. Otherwise, how would we know what we are going to test?

Now make sure we understand that this is really a controversial issue. That is why we never should have bypassed the Congress in the first place. That is why the debate should have been here. That is why the debate should go on next year, when we are reauthorizing TIMSS, when we are reauthorizing NAEPs, programs where we spend millions of dollars every year from the Federal level in the business of testing.

But if we think there is a consensus out there, then we are missing some very important points. There is no consensus. Let me just read one portion from a letter signed by 500 or more mathematicians from across this country. This is what those mathematicians said:

The committee which is drafting the exam specifications is biased. First, nearly all of its members are strong advocates of the NCTM standards and of programs that reputed to be aligned with the NCTM standards. There is not a balance of different viewpoints regarding mathematics education.

Second, members of the committee have significant conflict of interest, as they are activity involved in the writing or promotion of particular mathematics curricula. Even the slightest suspicion that the authors would bias the test toward material covered in their program, or that their authorship of the tests would be used to sell their program or to help them get grants, undermines the credibility of the exam.

So I want my colleagues to understand how controversial this is. Now we have decided that we are going to narrowly focus it, I hope. Then we have decided what it is we wanted to test. And then after we have made that decision, someone must write that curriculum in order so that we are testing toward what it is that was taught.

After we have done all of that, the next step then is, of course, to educate

the teacher, to prepare the teacher to teach to the new standards, to teach to what it is for which we are testing. And after we have done all of that, there is one big step left; and that is, as every testing expert will tell you, it takes 3 to 4 years to develop a valid test. Not 1 year, like the plan is, 3 to 4 years.

We are going to hear some say, "Oh, but this is voluntary." Nonsense. What Federal program do my colleagues know, once it was started, is voluntary? I tell my colleagues what will happen. The 50 percent that I talked about who were fortunate enough to have preschool readiness programs, that 50 percent, as soon as school A decides to do the test, they are going to demand that school B does the test, and then school C is going to demand that they get what school B got, and it will not be long until, as a matter of fact, it will be a national individual test.

Let me also point out to school districts and States: Be very careful. You worry about unfunded mandates. There is the one shot only from the Federal Government; and when that one shot is over, it is your responsibility. And if you are wrapped into it, you are going to have to find a way to pay for it, I will guarantee you.

The program that was rammed through at midnight in the other body, no deliberation, no consideration, is positively totally inadequate, unacceptable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOODLING was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, it reminds me of you are a contractor and you had one contractor who built the foundation, a totally inadequate foundation, a foundation that is going to collapse; and then you bring in another contractor, and then that new contractor is somehow or other going to try to build a new house on top of a flawed foundation. It cannot work.

Let me tell my colleagues some other things they did. It is pretty interesting. I never heard before where one sitting group determines who serves in that group, and that is what they did over there. NAGB will make the recommendations to the Secretary as to who should serve on this independent board. Now that is pretty dangerous. There is one other thing that is dangerous. They then become pretty much a national school board. I do not think our local and State governments are going to be very happy about that.

So please, if we have \$100 million to spend, let us help children become reading ready, let us help parents become better teachers. We do not do that by testing. We do that by providing the necessary tools so that, as a matter of fact, they are reading and writing.

And do not cause the first-grade child to fail. The first-grade child did not

fail. The adults failed. So we have a pre-first program. I could have 2,500 of those for \$100 million. And in those programs the kindergarten teacher knows very well who is reading ready. We have this crazy idea somehow or other that if they are 5½ or 6 years old, they are ready to read.

□ 1815

No one tells you who is ready to read except the children themselves. They may be at 20 different reading levels with 20 different students in the same classroom. Do not cause them to fail first grade. And do not socially promote them, above all. Give them the opportunity to be successful.

We will again next year determine what it is we do with NAGB, determine what we do with NAEP's. That is the time for a discussion on testing. Do not do an end run on the Congress of the United States. We were not sent here to be an end run team. We were sent here to deliberate and do what is right.

Again, when Members are ready to vote, think in terms of children. Do not let them tell you somehow or other that they will do much better if the parents only know. The parents know. The parents have been told over and over again. The parents are saying, help us, and help our children.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything that the chairman of the authorizing committee said. I accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 60 minutes with the time to be divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], 25 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Goodling amendment. This amendment would prevent the adoption of a voluntary testing program. It would prevent parents, cities and States from pursuing a new strategy in our efforts to provide all of our students with the best education in the world.

Let me make it very clear that many House Democrats strongly support the President's initiative. If this amendment passes, it might be a victory for the Republican leadership, but in my judgment it will be a clear defeat for the children of this country.

Voluntary testing will promote reform, excellence. The Goodling amendment undermines educational progress and codifies mediocrity. Quite frankly,

a vote for the Goodling amendment is a vote in favor of the status quo. That is simply not good enough.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and I have worked on a whole range of educational initiatives. I am sorry that we disagree so strongly on this one.

Mr. Chairman, the President's initiative will not nationalize education. There are no mandates here. A State will not lose money or face penalties if it chooses not to participate. The program simply provides an opportunity for interested cities and States to test their fourth-graders in reading and eighth-graders in math and measure their performance against students across town and across the Nation. Should a parent or a school not have the ability to make these comparisons?

Frankly, it is very ironic that many of the same Members who support educational competition through school choice are today opposing educational competition through performance measures. What are they afraid of? Do they fear American students cannot compete? I do not. I know that our students can compete and win.

My colleagues should be aware that this amendment is opposed by a wide array of educators, including the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the chiefs of our State education departments, the National School Boards Association and the National Association of Elementary School Principals.

I know that some opponents say we should be investing more directly in teachers, books, computers and school construction. I certainly agree. We need to invest more in education, and at the same time we ask more of our students in schools, we must provide them with the resources they so desperately need. That is why I am the lead sponsor of the President's school construction initiative. That is why I support increases in title I.

This is not an either/or proposition. I am pleased that six of the Nation's seven largest cities have accepted the challenge of national reading and math tests, including New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Atlanta and Detroit. These cities want to participate in a voluntary testing program. Communities across the Nation have concluded that they want to find out what needs fixing. They want to offer their students the best education possible. They want to ensure that they are preparing their children for a very competitive future, and they want to embrace the challenge and possibilities of voluntary national performance measures.

Two things about these tests are worth noting. First, the tests will be based on the well-respected National Assessment of Education Progress. Second, the highly respected National Academy of Sciences will approve the tests before the first student in the first school sits down with pencil in hand to take the exam. These tests will be developed the right way.

I believe very strongly in raising academic standards. If my colleagues in Congress agree, and I think we all do, then we must finally say no more excuses. We know that students and schools can achieve. We expect them to achieve. We will help them achieve. Voluntary testing is an important component of this process.

I believe that the combination of educational investments and performance standards is a recipe for student success. I would urge my colleagues not to prevent the creation of a voluntary national testing system as a State and local option. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Goodling amendment. And I would urge my colleagues to work with us to support investments in school construction, to support different comprehensive changes in our school system. Because we support this, that does not mean we cannot support school testing as well.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to share my personal concerns with regard to the administration's proposed national test in reading. First, I want to say that I am wholeheartedly supportive of measures to achieve higher standards for America's schools and students and that I applaud the administration's laudable efforts to improve public education. I do not, however, feel that testing is the route to pursue. Quite simply, I have reservations about the inability of the proposed national tests to improve educational opportunities for all children. These tests may leave out several million limited English-proficient students from taking the test and assessing their skills in reading.

I grew up in an agricultural community in south Texas, and I attended a segregated elementary school where the Mexican American children were separated from children of Anglo-Saxon heritage. Spanish was my first language. I learned a little bit of English, only after my parents enrolled me in the public school system. It took years of practice and the interest and support of my caring parents and teachers along the way before I became fully conversant in the English language. Even so, in my early years in my reading comprehension skills were not what they could have been if I had started the first grade English-ready.

In 1972, I was elected to the local school board in Mercedes, Texas, and in 1974, I was elected to the Texas State Board of Education where I served for four terms. Of that period, 8 years I served as chairman of the Special Populations Committee, which covered bilingual education, migrant education, special education and gifted and talented education programs.

For 25 years I have been a very strong advocate of education. It is in that capacity that I became aware as a policymaker of the difficulties limited English-proficient students, LEP students as they are called, have. Also in

that capacity I learned about the art of learning in any language and the importance of learning in the native language.

The whole testing issue raises a red flag for LEP students. It stigmatizes them by both peers and teachers. It sets up the LEP students to fail. When that kicks in, young people begin to drop out of school.

America's elementary and secondary schools will become more diverse in the next 10 years. Between 1995 and 2005, for example, Hispanic Americans between the ages of 5 and 17 will increase by 2.4 million. African American students in this same age group will increase by another 1.1 million. Asian Americans and other minorities will number an additional 1.1 million. The word "diverse" will best describe the Nation's public schools where the formal education and socialization of the young occurs.

For the last decade, reports on the state of education for Hispanics and other minority populations have been poor. A recently released report by the U.S. Department of Education found that the Nation's dropout rate for persons between ages 16 and 24 in 1995 was 12 percent, while the dropout rate for Hispanic students was over 30 percent. The Hispanic high school dropout situation was described by the President in meetings that the Hispanic Caucus and I had with him as a national crisis of economic importance.

We can ill afford to allow another generation of Hispanic Americans and other populations whose primary language is other than English to fall by the wayside. This has far-ranging economic consequences for the population at large.

While it is with a heavy heart that I oppose the President on this issue, I must do so. My reasons are as follows: Standardized testing has a negative, disparate impact on poor and minority students. Equal opportunity in testing cannot be achieved given unequal educational opportunity. Even if testing procedures could be devised to eliminate bias, enormous inequalities in school financing systems and teacher quality and disparities in access to educational technology, combined with discriminatory practices such as tracking and uneven access to high-quality counseling severely restrict the educational opportunities available to poor and minority students. Until issues of resource disparity, discrimination and reliability have been resolved, the national test should not be used as a basis for making high-stakes educational decisions. It is inappropriate.

Mr. Chairman, again I oppose the national testing as proposed.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Goodling amendment and really thank him and express appreciation for his courageous leadership on this subject. He has focused a spotlight

on a subject that the Department of Education really wanted to slip through rather unnoticed, and he deserves credit for that. Because we have raised our voices here, over a period of a few weeks, we now have a bipartisan supported agreement here in the form of the Goodling amendment to eliminate funding for this ill-advised encroachment on the direction of curriculum that is best defined in my opinion at the State and local level.

I guess we can say that we are making progress! We are making progress all right. But this is a crucial policy question. These changes and the so-called compromises that preceded this final redefinition by the department that is the compromises that the Department of Education put out every time a legitimate question was raised. After each critical question raised they backed off and they made a so-called compromise or adjustment. As I observed over and over it began to look as though they were making it up as they went along. That is, I am sorry to say was what the Department was doing. I was rather perplexed. As a member of the committee, I must say that I always believed that the Department and Secretary Riley were better than that, and I think it was not up to their regular standards, and I am sorry to have to say that. But it is proof that we need a thorough and thoughtful didactic study on how we should do this, if at all, without opening the door to a national curriculum or the establishment of what I see as the possibility of a full-fledged Ministry of Education.

□ 1830

Please, do not get me wrong. I believe that a national debate on educational standards and achievement levels is overdue. We have critical problems in our schools and we should get back to basics. Our declining achievement levels are an absolute embarrassment. The United States at the Federal level, the State level, the community level, and at the family level, should dedicate itself to raising the standards for educational achievement. We certainly owe it to our children.

But I also strongly believe that testing for the sake of testing serves no purpose, and it certainly does not serve that one. It costs a lot of money, as the chairman already outlined, money that could be better directed to classroom instructions where we could directly help the children of the Nation.

Let us get our priorities straight. Let us fund the programs that work and avoid expensive new educational experiments on our children.

Mr. Chairman, let me summarize in this way: The committee must not be bypassed. We must use the reauthorization process in the next year to study, analyze, and set realistic goals for whatever additional testing may, and I stress, may, be merited, but no more direction or indirection from the department without full debate and analysis.

Number two, we can now have the time to set priorities with a clear goal of directing more monies to instruction, direct instruction in the classroom, whether for teacher training or equipment or individualized instruction, which are my favorites, and, yes, including more money for Early Start and Head Start, as the chairman pointed out, reading readiness programs.

Finally, I think it is important that we a renewed commitment here and now with this vote to State and local control. It is State and local control that is a fundamental of good public education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge full support of this amendment.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with a great deal of respect for the authorizing committee chair and work with Members on the opposite side of the aisle on a lot of educational issues. I am surprised to see this amendment before us and strongly rise to oppose it.

This is a country that prides itself on testing. Every child that is going to go to a university has to go out and take an SAT exam. If he or she is going to go to medical school, it is a national exam to take; to go to law school one has to take an exam.

We test water and we test air, we test milk, yet now we do not want to test the minds of the kids in this country. We do not want to test their ability in the fourth grade to read or their ability in the seventh grade to do math.

I think what the real fear of this national testing is that the people we are going to find that are flunking the tests is Congress itself, in not appropriating enough money for education. You hear minority groups in this Congress rising against this testing because they do not want kids to be tracked, they do not want kids to be stigmatized, and I agree with that, because I think we are going to find we are not spending enough money on the remedial title I programs to remedy those problems.

We are going to find we are not spending enough money, as Congresswoman LOWEY said a moment ago, in her bill to allow the Federal Government for the first time in history to be a partner in school construction, we are not spending any money to build the classrooms so we can create the environment in which kids can learn better.

Congress is going to flunk the test in showing we do not put enough money into construction, into remedial programs, into special education programs, into migrant education programs or any of the title I programs.

Why, I would like to know, is the Republican leadership in Washington so strongly opposed to testing, when the Republican leadership in Sacramento held up the adjournment of the California State Legislature insisting that they do testing? The arguments pro

and con are the same arguments that were held here today.

The point is that the biggest State in the country with the most children in school and the seventh largest economy in the world realizes that unless we have accountability in education we will not be able to compete in a global environment, in a competitive environment.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment. Allow those who want to test to do the testing. Allow this country to see that we need to invest more in education, not less, to improve reading and math, to let kids know how they are doing. The only way we are going to be able to do that—which is consistent with what we insist when they graduate from high school so that they can get into college—is to allow for a national test on a voluntary basis. The only way we are going to get there from here is to defeat this amendment.

So I urge my colleagues to work with us in defeating the amendment and allowing the President's program to be in the bill.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], our chairman, for offering this amendment, and I rise to strongly support it, and I am particularly pleased to immediately follow behind my friend from California, Mr. FARR.

I would point out that the California Republicans did a great job out there. It is their job, you know, to manage education in their State. It is a State function, and if they wanted testing in California, more power to them.

I want to mention just a minute about what the Goodling amendment is all about, because I do not want anybody at the end of this vote to be unclear on it. This amendment simply prohibits spending of any money under the fiscal year 1998 Labor-HHS-Labor appropriations bill to develop, plan, implement or administer new national tests in the fourth grade reading and eighth grade math.

I can rather understand why our chairman would be so concerned to have this amendment, since none of this has been authorized in his committee or appropriated. So I think it is appropriate that he do stand up about this.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] does make exceptions, and the exceptions are made for the National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP; also the Third International Math and Science Study, TIMSS, both of which would be allowed to continue. NAEP, also known as the Nation's report card, involves random sample testing of students throughout the country in reading, math, science, history and other subjects every 2 years at the 4th, 8th and 12th grade levels, to obtain a snapshot of the academic achievement of students in our country.

TIMSS involves random sample testing of students in this country and other nations in math and science to obtain international comparisons of student achievement. I remind Members that this amendment allows this testing to continue.

Earlier it was said that we do not test our children. The administration would have us believe that there is a real need for standardized tests to determine how our kids are doing in reading and in math, as if we are not testing them now.

So let us look at one of my former constituents, who is also a former constituent of my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP] and is currently a constituent of my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF]. Rebecca Stone of Warrenton, VA, just finished the eighth grade last June.

Now, here is the list of standardized tests that she has taken in a country where earlier it was stated we do not test our children.

In Mitchell County, GA, kindergarten through the first grade, Rebecca had the Georgia Test for Kindergartners, the Otis Lennon Mental Abilities Test and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Then in Richmond County, GA, in the second grade, she retook the Iowa Test of Basic Skills again. Then in Columbia County, GA, in the third through sixth grades, she had the Iowa Basic Skill Test twice more and the Duke University Talent Test. Finally, in Fauquier County, VA, in the seventh and eighth grades, this young lady was tested with the Virginia Literacy Passport Test and the Stanford Achievement Test.

I think, as readily can be seen by most of our colleagues, a real live public school student we are standard testing across this country. What this debate is really about is not testing, but it is about curriculum. Testing is just the next step in a liberal agenda for Washington to seize control of our local schools. My folks at home do not want that. They do not think that the Department of Education should run their local schools.

If the Federal Government establishes testing on which all of our school systems are judged, the next step will be for the Federal Government to establish a national curriculum to match the test. We say this is voluntary, but I find that humorous. It is not, and we all know it.

Mr. Chairman, we already have standardized tests in use in our public schools today. They are tests freely chosen by State and local educators and recognized nationally. What the administration seems to want is to overrule the testing decisions of local educators and replace them with the decision of inside-the-Beltway bureaucrats. Let us put a stop to that. Support the Goodling amendment. It is very important.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. SAWYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this amendment, and also to set the record straight about my own statements on the subject of national testing.

The sponsor of this amendment sent a "Dear Colleague" around earlier this week that contains a quote from me from 1992:

If testing becomes one of the engines of educational reform in this decade we had better be prepared. Those of us who come from States where testing has already become a tool for making policy know that the issue is fraught with peril and consequences for individual students and communities.

However, what his "Dear Colleague" does not include is my next paragraph:

What I wholeheartedly endorse is the development of national standards. This will take time, not a lot, but time. Then tests—as instruments—need to be very finely tuned. Only then should we begin to think about using them on a national scale.

What I was saying in 1992, and what I continue to believe, is that tests should not be used simply as a right-of-passage. Their objective must not be solely to create measurements on a national scale with no real benefit to students, nor even to measure the success of local school districts or individual schools.

Such tests—used as instruments of education—can be extremely effective as a method for identifying weaknesses in instruction and learning. They can be equally valuable in identifying specific needs of individual students. Tests that provide individual student evaluation—measured against high standards—will help students, teachers, parents and schools to raise achievement if they are combined with comprehensive remediation. Only then can the results become effective in raising performance more broadly across larger student populations.

The approach proposed by the President and the Secretary of Education clearly demonstrates that understanding. For that reason, I wholeheartedly support allowing the Department of Education to continue its work to develop these tests.

We have standards that have been developed locally and can be shared nationally; to be adopted by local schools, or adapted to their specific needs. It is now time to couple them with tests that will not only measure our progress toward those high goals, but will also help teachers and students reach them. That's what real education ought to be about.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment to my colleague who just spoke, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD], that in fact 81 percent of the students in Georgia meet the minimum acceptable standards that are in Georgia. However, only 16 percent meet the minimum acceptable standards in any national testing of the same students.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would unnecessarily delay the development and the implementation of national reading and math tests, and I hope my colleagues will join me in defeating it.

Our children will compete for jobs in the national and even in a global marketplace. We know our workers, our products, and our economy can be the very, very best in the world, and we need to do everything in our power to ensure our schools are giving our kids the tools they need to compete in the economy of the 21st century.

We must not reject this important tool to ensure that every child can read, write, and do basic mathematics. Parents across the country share my belief that these are the very minimum standards to which our students and, more importantly, our schools should be held accountable.

My colleagues who support this amendment argue that there are plenty of other tests and measures of school achievement. I would point out that in Wisconsin and in Louisiana, according to State tests, more than 80 percent of students are meeting acceptable competency levels. However, when Wisconsin and Louisiana students take national tests, fewer than 40 percent meet minimum standards. The same thing about what I just talked about with regard to Georgia students.

Our parents deserve an objective, reliable measure of how their children are doing in school, how well the schools are preparing their children. All of us as taxpayers deserve objective, reliable information to hold schools accountable. We need to be sure that our local school systems are meeting our national expectations.

I understand some of my colleagues have legitimate concerns about how the tests will be implemented, what it may mean for students who are low income or disadvantaged, whose achievement levels are traditionally lower than their more advantaged peers. I believe the concerns are valid and need to be addressed. Four million children should not be left out of this process.

Those who would argue that we know what the problems are and yet we do not want to commit the funding, they are right. We have seen in this body in the last 2 or 3 years people who would like to cut the education budget more than any cuts in the history of the United States. We must identify the problems and provide the resources necessary.

I do not believe we should hold up the development of this initiative, which cannot be implemented for at least another year, even if we start working on the tests now. I know with the support for the whole school reform initiative that was included in this bill, with the renewed commitment to helping every American student achieve, all of our students in all of our schools can make the grade.

In the Third District of Connecticut, people sometimes wonder why Washington is so slow to address the real problems faced by families struggling to raise their kids to be responsible, productive adults and citizens. They wonder why the House would vote to delay this important tool another 1

year, 2 years, or until the Congress holds hearings and debates.

□ 1845

My colleagues, let us remember that we are talking about taking a test to be sure that fourth graders can read and eighth graders can do mathematics. It is no more, no less than that.

This debate is not about nationalized control of education. States will not be penalized for choosing not to administer the tests. This debate is not about taking power away from parents or from school boards. In fact, it will empower parents and school boards to hold schools accountable.

The author of this amendment shared this view just a few short years ago when it was his proposal to have standardized testing. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] was an original cosponsor of the Bush administration's central education initiative, America 2000 Excellence in Education Act. Included in this bill were voluntary national testing for 4th, 8th and 12th graders. The gentleman from Pennsylvania also introduced an amendment to establish a process in support of voluntary national education standards and a national system of examinations. It was a good idea then, and it is a good idea now.

I urge my colleagues to demonstrate that we are serious about educating our children, serious about holding our schools to the highest possible standards. Let us give parents the tools that they need to hold our schools accountable. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment. It is not a complicated issue that we are talking about here tonight. The issue is simply one of control. The power to test is the power to control. The power to determine whether we have validated through a testing process is the power to determine how that process is arrived at.

I would suggest that what we are engaged in here now is, first of all, an unauthorized effort by the Department of Education at the Federal level to foist on the American public and on this Congress a testing procedure that has not been authorized. First of all, we should not allow the bypass of this congressional body to determine where the money is to be spent in education.

But, second, I would suggest to my colleagues that this is a very clever way, and a very disguised hook; it is the beginning of a curve that leads to a circle. The chairman has outlined it partially in his testimony. The power to test and thereby to evaluate the test, if it is not a satisfactory result, then would dictate that Washington would have the power to determine the curriculum, since obviously the States and local communities were not properly addressing the curriculum since their test results were not appropriate.

Also, if then by addressing the curriculum the test results are still not adequate, then the next step would be for the Federal Government in Washington and the Department of Education to address the selection and the training of the teachers who are administering the curriculum. Then, if the test results are still not appropriate, the next step would be obviously that the administration that is supervising the teachers who are teaching the curriculum and who are giving the test, if not adequate, then obviously Washington should assume responsibility for that as well.

One can take this circle in ever-ending cycles and go right down to the fact that the ultimate result is that this is an effort for Washington to control education. It has traditionally been the responsibility of States and local communities; it should remain that way.

I would suggest to the preceding speaker that the results of the children in my State of Georgia are best left to the determination of their local elected school boards, that it is best left to their elected State school superintendent and the State school board that works in conjunction with her, and that these are issues that we in our State can adequately address; and unless Washington is willing to assume all of the responsibility, which none of us I think want to see happen, that we should leave it at the level where it is of local and State responsibility.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out to the gentleman who just spoke an editorial in the Connecticut News. Quote: "It would take valuable time away from instruction. We are tested out at this point. I don't find any support from my colleagues," said Bridgeport Superintendent of Schools James A. Connelly. "Quite frankly, we have at least two full weeks involved in testing."

William Breck, superintendent of schools for Durham and Middlefield and chairman of the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, agreed: "We get the type of information that we need already. To add another layer at the Federal level is not going to help. It may help the politicians."

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the adoption of the Goodling amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is going to pass; it is going to pass by a significant margin. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the subcommittee chairman, has already accepted the amendment. And for purposes of making clear to the administration that they have a lot of work to

do in working out their differences, not only with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] but with segments of my own caucus, on behalf of the committee I want to indicate that we will accept the amendment as well.

However, if it comes to a rollcall vote, I personally will vote "no," representing not the committee but myself as an individual member. I would like to explain why.

I am a convert on this issue. I have never felt particularly strongly one way or another on the issue of testing. I think there are many more important things to do in the field of education besides simply test, and when the idea of national testing first became respectable a number of years ago, I was very skeptical about it. I thought that teachers would wind up teaching to the test; I thought all of the things that a lot of opponents of testing think now. I thought that it would disadvantage students from low-dollar districts, districts that are not supported with a great deal of financial resources. I thought all of those things.

I guess even Members of Congress can learn something, and at least I think I have, because I talked to a good many school administrators, a good many parents in my own district, and listening to them I gradually changed my view of this issue. I did so for the following reasons.

It is nice to talk about States being able to administer their own tests. It is nice to talk about how well students do on a State's individual test. But the fact is, I was born in Oklahoma. I wound up growing up in Wisconsin. Most people in this society are mobile, and the mistakes that are made in many localities in this country often wind up being exported to some other part of the country, and all communities experience, sooner or later, the consequences of a lack of quality in education, whether that occurs in their own area or whether that occurs in some other district, because people move into communities all the time.

I think the national government has a responsibility to try to assist local districts in their own way to improve quality just as much as possible, and I think that parents do not care much whether the initiative for testing comes from Washington or from Madison or from their own hometown, just so long as there is constant pressure on the system to change and to increase the quality that is being delivered to every single student in this country. I think that testing can play a useful role in that process.

Now, I think we need to point out a few things. First of all, the bill itself does not allow the administration to proceed with testing. The bill, in fact, specifically precludes the administration from proceeding with testing, and I personally thought that the language that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] had worked out on the bill was sufficient to satisfy those who had questions about it. I was obviously wrong.

I would point out that under the bill the administration cannot proceed to test; all it can do is develop a test which then must be sent to the National Academy of Science so that they can review the validity and the accuracy of the test, so that they can in essence serve as a quality control element in the process. That does not satisfy persons who are opposed to the administration initiative, obviously.

The Senate has gone further; not far enough in the eyes of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but they have gone a far piece. They have, for instance, taken away policy oversight from the Department of Education and they have given it to the National Assessment Governing Board.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. BEREUTER]. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, that means that authority over all policy guidelines for this testing is being moved to that board; it will not be under the Department of Education. In addition, that board is being expanded to include a higher number of local officials, and along the way they exempted home schoolers; they made quite clear that home schoolers were exempted from any testing.

Now, in practical terms, the administration has indicated that it will not sign a bill that does not allow them to develop the process or continue the process of developing testing.

Now as I said, as far as the committee is concerned, after consultation with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], I am accepting the amendment, simply to make clear that the administration does need to do a lot more work in talking not only with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], but frankly with additional members of my own party. It is no secret that significant members of the Hispanic caucus and significant members of the Black Caucus of my own party support the Goodling amendment.

I understand their concerns, but frankly, I believe that even if students are originally learning in another language, I believe that they need to take that test in English by the time they get to around the fourth grade.

I understand and respect the concerns of several members of the Black Caucus that it is futile to provide testing if we do not also have a commitment to provide additional resources so that schools with little financial support can, in fact, have an opportunity to perform decently on those tests.

However, I have a different tactical view. It happens to be my view that if this testing consistently demonstrates that low-income districts are not doing well on the tests, I believe that that will generate additional public demands for added resources to those districts.

So basically, I think we have a lot of suspicion about whether these tests are going to be legitimate, whether they are going to be biased or not. People are concerned about it philosophically. We have a lot of concerns about whether these tests are going to be unfair, and I recognize all of that, and I can only say that at some time I think it is important that these problems be resolved. The only way I know to resolve them is by people sitting down in the same room and working them out.

I would simply note the words of Chester Finn, who used to be the number two man in the Department of Education under the Republican administration, and I have disagreed with Mr. Finn often, but he was quoted in the newspaper today saying something that I think is right on. He said, "If this testing initiative runs into trouble, it will be because conservatives will not swallow the word 'national' and liberals will not swallow the word 'testing.'"

It seems to me that both need to overcome their own concerns, because I really believe that in the end testing is going to be a crucial element in convincing the public that more resources need to be provided to poorly-financed districts in this country.

□ 1900

I do believe that parents have a right to know how their children do perform on tests which are viewed nationwide. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] may very well be right.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] may very well be right, that a lot more work needs to be done. It seems to me that the right course would be to go into conference and work out a mutually agreed position. I still think in the end, regardless of the outcome of this amendment, that is what we are going to need to do.

So when this amendment passes today, I hope people on all sides recognize that in the end, evaluation of student performance is a good thing. I believe testing is a good thing if it is done in the right manner, and I think we need to figure out a way to make sure that it can proceed.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman GOODLING, which prohibits the administration from using funds within the education appropriations bill for the development of a national test.

I believe this amendment is necessary and very important. The gentleman from the other side of the aisle has indicated that the Department is

not proceeding, but yet we see there has been a \$13 million contract already let in order to start developing the test. This amendment is very timely and important.

There are those who believe and argue that a national test will help solve our educational problems. They believe it will set a national benchmark for our students so they may prepare for the future, and students would achieve higher academic standards as a result of these tests, and that the comparison of the results of tests between the States would somehow help the students to prepare effectively for the work force.

Mr. Chairman, I believe what H.L. Mencken once said applies directly to the Department of Education's initiative. He says, "There is always an easy solution to every human problem—neat, plausible and wrong." That applies in this case. Testing will not create greater performance, it only provides an assessment. The creation of national tests would become the vehicle for a national curriculum.

How does this happen, we might ask? Because the content of school curriculum can be directed by the development of national tests. We need to keep control of our children's education in the hands of the local people who work daily with our children and our parents to properly educate them. They are the most qualified to assess their educational needs. We do not need to justify an even more bloated and unmanageable Department of Education.

Let us invest the money in our children, not in more administrative paperwork. The people of Arkansas are not demanding national tests, they are demanding good education. That comes from the local school boards, the parents, teachers who are dedicated do that proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We have before us an opportunity this evening to help all American children reach their potential by objectively testing the basic education they are receiving. We need to keep in mind what we are talking about: A simple, effective way to measure American student performance in the basics of education: Reading and math.

We are not talking about other noncore subjects, only reading and math. We are not talking about a new Federal program or a grand one-size-fits-all Federal study, we are talking about a voluntary tool to be used by parents, teachers, and local schools to assess the results of their own education efforts and the money they are spending, and to then chart a course toward improvement.

Most importantly, parents deserve to know whether their children are being educated early enough in life so correc-

tive action may be taken, because their children deserve to be prepared to compete with children not from their school district and not from their State, but from around the globe. Mr. Chairman, our children are not here to argue this this evening, but we are not doing American children any favor by not giving their parents the tools to measure whether they are being educated.

I urge Members not to stop an initiative that should have occurred years ago. Think of our children's future, and oppose this amendment.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for President Clinton's national testing scheme.

The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania would prevent the Department of Education from developing a national test unless authorized to do so by Congress. While I share the concerns of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that the administration should not take such a drastic step as developing national testing without congressional authorization, and I thank the gentleman for all his leadership in fighting for this amendment, the fact is the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to develop national testing even with congressional approval.

National testing is another significant step toward total nationalization of education. National testing will ultimately lead to fulfillment of the dream of the enemies of the constitutional system of local and parental control of education, the de facto creation of a national curriculum.

Mr. Chairman, the administration claims that the testing program would be voluntary. However, I remind my colleagues that this is the same administration that considers the Goals 2000 a voluntary program, despite the numerous times Goals 2000 uses the terms "shall" and "must" in describing State functions.

Furthermore, whether or not schools are directly ordered to administer the tests, schools will face pressure to do so as colleagues and employers inevitably begin to use national tests as the standard by which students are measured for college entrance exams and entry-level jobs. At the very least, schools would soon find Federal and perhaps even State funding dependent on their voluntary participation in the national testing programs.

When all or at least the majority of the schools are administering national tests, the tests will then be the standard against which all schools will be measured. Those schools whose students did poorly on the national test would be labeled as doing a poor job of

educating children. Educators would react to this pressure to ensure that students scored highly on the national test by teaching the test; that is, structure the curriculum so students can learn those subjects and only those subjects covered by the national tests.

As University of Kansas professor John Poggio remarked in February, "What gets tested is what will be taught." Government bureaucrats would control the curriculum of every school in the Nation, and they would be able to alter the curriculum at will by altering the national test.

Private schools and home schools will be affected as well, as performance on the national tests become the standard by which student performance is judged. Those in private and home schools will face increasing pressure to participate in national testing and to shape what is taught to the criteria of the test itself.

The Department of Education has already admitted its ultimate aim is for a national curriculum. According to a United Press International story on the national assessment of educational progress reprinted in the Santa Rosa Press Democrat in May, "The Education Department * * * hopes the kinds of questions involved in the voluntary test will shape the way science is taught."

Mr. Chairman, under the United States Constitution, the enumerated powers of the Federal Government simply do not include education. Yet the Clinton administration's national test proposal will inevitably result in Federal bureaucrats dictating what every child in America will be taught. National testing represents another giant step in the centralizing of American education and a giant step away from America's constitutional republic.

I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in opposing all moves to implement a national testing scheme, starting by supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] to prohibit the expenditures of Federal funds to develop and administer a national testing program without explicit authorization from Congress.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to prohibit the expenditure of funds to develop a national test. We need opportunities to learn before we mandate national tests. In the overall, comprehensive effort to improve our schools, there is a place for a national testing program, but it is counterproductive and oppressive to launch a fast-track stampede for a national test without simultaneously implementing other desperately needed Federal initiatives.

Our national campaign to promote opportunity-to-learn standards ought

to come before or in concert with the push for a national test. Testing without opportunity-to-learn standards or other reforms is merely a measurement of the status quo. We know what the tests are going to tell us before we give them.

When there is no effort to improve school facilities or to provide adequate libraries, laboratories, computers, and other learning necessities, the burden of improving education is dumped solely on the backs of the pupils. Under this condition, with gross sins of omission, national testing with high stakes and scores that will remain with students for a lifetime become the instruments for the abuse of students.

We need a moratorium on testing until other school improvement components are implemented with greater vigor than they are now being pursued. The Federal school construction initiative, the construction initiative which will provide safe facilities conducive to study, must be placed back on the political track. Adequate physical facilities do not automatically improve learning; however, they are at the heart of the opportunity-to-learn standards. Since local education agencies throughout the Nation are experiencing overcrowding and infrastructure decay, school construction is a universal priority.

National testing is not a priority. National testing is a highly visible device, but at this critical point the campaign for educational reform deserves more than a dramatic, headline-grabbing gesture. Instead of this piecemeal, isolated gimmick, we need a more balanced and inclusive approach to school improvement.

America's children will be best served by returning to the working compromise that was reached in the 1994 Elementary and Secondary Educational Assistance Act. At that time it was agreed that a three-part Federal initiative would be launched to promote national curriculum standards, national testing standards, and national opportunity-to-learn standards.

This agreement was violated when, through a back door rules-violating Committee on Appropriations deal, the section of the law related to opportunity-to-learn standards was repealed in 1996. States and local governments are no longer exhorted to voluntarily raise their opportunity-to-learn standards. Only the students now have the burden placed on their backs. They have been abandoned by the Federal advocacy process, and they are being loudly challenged to meet new accountability demands that their local education agencies are not being exhorted to develop, and also the States are not being held accountable.

We now have a window of opportunity, since Americans do think education is a high priority and have made that clear, we have a window of opportunity, and we can offer American students a better deal than more tests with less opportunities to learn. We can do more than just test students.

The American people clearly want better schools, and public officials who are able to deliver a machinery for it are desired also by the electorate. It is not an exaggeration to contend that at this particular moment a bipartisan educational achievement of great magnitude is possible. Both Democrats and Republicans agree on enough components of education reform to forge ahead in this session of Congress.

Both parties agree that charter schools offer a way to experiment with governance and management which would provide competitive choices with a minimum loss of public control. Both parties agree that increased resources for teacher training and retraining is a need we jointly recognize. Encouraging the maximum use of technology to aid education is also an approach approved by both parties.

It would not be difficult to produce a bipartisan school package with substance. At a time when there are no absorbing global crises and very few national emergencies, the deliberative powers of both the executive and legislative branch could fashion a program with minimal intervention and a well-focused targeting to stimulate a chain reaction of State efforts to forge continuing improvements in education.

The most productive Federal role is to challenge the States and enhance the programs that work, and that can be implemented and managed at the State and local levels. A national school reform effort means that all levels of government must make their appropriate contribution. On the scale of priorities for reform, testing is way down on that list of priorities.

Both the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and the Leadership Council on Civil Rights opposed this.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OWENS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, also, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights has opposed this fast-track national testing initiative. They have given very sound reasons for opposing it.

To help the children of America, a bipartisan school reform package with substance is needed. We do not need gimmicks, we do not need block grants, we do not need national testing.

□ 1915

Vote "yes" on this amendment to prohibit the usurpation of the powers of the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would submit a couple of thoughts, Mr. Chairman. One is that we already have national tests. We have the Assessment of Education Progress test, the National Assessment of Education Progress test, the SAT, the ACT, the Ohio Test of Basic Skills, the California Achievement Test, the Metropoli-

tan Achievement Test, to name some of those national tests. In addition, we have many State and District tests. The danger is the President's suggestion that the Department of Education design the test. It has been said before, those that design the test, design the curriculum.

Allow me to cite one example. One area where some of us disagree for 4th graders might be that they all should be computer literate. So imagine that a test measures computer literacy among 4th graders in their reading test. Naturally, if a school wants to perform well, they are going to be forced to develop that curriculum that is mandated by a national test. So imagine many other areas that Washington thinks is important for testing but local school communities disagree. Those that design the test, design the curriculum and that decision should be left up to parents and school boards and teachers in the local community.

I would suggest that in this bill, section 306 on page 97, the language simply says that the National Academy of Science is going to evaluate and submit a report. They are going to evaluate: One, technical quality; two, adequacy of administration; three, reliability; four, validity of contractor's design; and five, degree to which the test can be expected to provide valid and useful information. And then the language on page 76, line 21, implies that after that is submitted, the Department of Education shall proceed to administer final version of that test.

Again, I submit that we do not need bureaucrats in Washington designing the curriculum that can be best judged and decided by local communities and local parents and local school boards.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Goodling amendment to deny funding to the President's national testing proposal. Mr. Chairman, widespread misuse of educational testing has disproportionately penalized poor and minority children. That is why the Congressional Black Caucus opposes the administration's proposed national testing standards for 4th and 8th graders and why we support the Goodling amendment to deny Federal funding for the initiative.

The CBC cannot support any testing that may further stigmatize our children and force them into lower educational tracks and special education classes. The national testing proposal provides no enforceable safeguards against the misuse of test results that can harm our children. Tracking, retention in grade, and ability grouping have all been used to the detriment of millions of students.

Testing is being misused right now in schools across the Nation, as demonstrated by the case in North Carolina where 14 students have filed an equal protection claim based on the

misuse of testing. This test appears designed to consciously disregard the estimated 3 million children nationwide with limited English proficiency by refusing to offer the 4th grade test, reading test, in any other language than English.

American students are among the most tested children in the world, yet our educational infrastructure continues to struggle. Paying for a national standardized test while continuing to neglect the pressing needs of our public schools reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of the crisis in our educational system. We need serious solutions to the pressing needs of our Nation's students, not misguided sound bite legislation.

I recently reviewed the test results of a test in California, it may have been the achievement test, and it told me what I already knew. The kids from Beverly Hills did very well; the kids from Compton and from Watts did not do as well. So we know a lot about tests and the results of tests. We need to ask now what do we do? How do we apply the resources to bring those children up? What do we do to invest in their opportunity?

If we want to do some assessments, let us not just test the children, let us take whole schools and school districts. Let us look at the teachers. Let us look at the principals. Let us look at the facilities. Let us find out whether or not they are wired to accommodate computers. Let us find out whether or not they have science laboratories.

I just talked to two of our staffers right here in Congress, and I asked them what did they think about this. They said their children go to schools where they do not have books; our children are attending schools where they have to send the paper towels for them to wash their hands; they have to send toilet tissue. They have to send everything to the school to try and make life in that school just decent for their children, yet at the same time we are in some debate about tests?

Let us have a real debate on education. Let us find out why we could not get a measly \$5 billion in the budget to rehabilitate our schools where the roofs are falling in, where we do not have air-conditioning, where heating is less than adequate. Let us have a real debate about education to talk about in-service training for our teachers.

Let us have a real debate. We are being sidetracked into a nondebate about educational testing. We have all kind of tests in the State. And if it is truly voluntary, and some will be doing it and some will not be doing it, why are we trying to have a national test? It is only national if we force it on everybody. So what if only half the Nation participates in this so-called national voluntary testing?

I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and a lot of people are going to wonder why the Hispanic Caucus and the Black Caucus

are joining with those on the other side of the aisle that we normally disagree with on so many issues. Well, I tell my colleagues, we are all taking a common sense approach to this issue. Be it Republican or Democrat, Latino Caucus or Black Caucus, we are taking this common sense approach because we have the lessons of our community about what is wrong with education.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The time of the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. Waters was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, our children are not failing because they did not have a national test. Our children are failing because in many cases there are just plain lack of resources in districts that are poor, that do not have the resources.

We have discovered from the testing who does best, as I identified with Beverly Hills and South Central Los Angeles. Our children are failing because many of our teachers are inadequate. Many of our teachers are not trained and prepared to do the kind of teaching that they should be doing to make our children successful. We are failing because we are not having the real debate about the needs of our schools and our children.

I tell my colleagues far too many schools in America cannot even have computer labs because they are not wired to accept the computers to do what they should be doing. Let us forget about this so-called national test. Let us get into a real debate and design what our children need to make them successful.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in support of the Goodling amendment. The Goodling amendment, I think, puts into proper perspective the Federal role in education.

The Federal Government really has no responsibility to go out and test every child in the 4th and 8th grade. We do test on a random basis. Through NAEP, we test children at the 4th, 8th and 12th grade levels, and we get a sampling so that we can get a comparison between how students from one State are doing compared to the other. But we have not put the Federal Government in the role of testing every 4th grader and every 8th grader and every 12th grader, because that is not the job of the Federal Government.

What we do have is we have States who are working through this process, who are setting State standards, who are setting and putting in place State tests to fulfill the proper role that the States employ, which is to control and work with the local units of government in managing education in this country.

We have been involved in a process over the last year where we have gone

around the country and we have taken a look at what is going on in education; what is working, what is not working. And it has been very interesting as we have taken a look at the various States and they have shared with us what they are doing in the area of testing.

This should be a word of caution to those of us in Washington before we embark down that road. We were in the State of Delaware. The State of Delaware is about the size of one congressional district. We are trying to design a test here for 435 congressional districts.

As the governor described the process that they went through in designing a State test, he described a very intensive process, a collaborative process between parents, educational professionals, the schools, other interest groups, to design a test that could be given to the students in Delaware, and that when the results came back would be accepted by the parents, by the educators, the administrators and other people that had a vested interest in having a good educational system and that the test would actually mean something.

It took the State of Delaware about 3 years to come up with a test. The State of Delaware is now going through a process of deciding exactly how to administer the test and, when they get the tests back, exactly how to use the results and what decisions can be made off of those tests. This has to be a slow, deliberative process. It needs buy-in, and it needs to be done at the State level and not at the Federal level.

The State of Michigan is going through much of the same struggle, of designing a test that will be widely accepted and will actually enable decision-makers, whether it is a parent, whether it is a teacher or a school district or a governor, a test that will enable those types of individuals to make the kinds of decisions that they need to make; that will actually be an asset in helping them outline educational strategy.

In Michigan what we are finding is that parts of the tests have been widely accepted but we have some problems. Students are opting out; parents are opting their kids out. In some cases we have actually had some school districts advising some of their kids to stay home on the days that the tests are given so that they can manipulate the test scores.

It does not mean the State of Michigan should not be involved in the testing process, but it means that even after having worked on this for a number of years, we still have a lot of work to complete before we will have a valid test in the State of Michigan that parents, students and educators will support.

This work needs to happen at the State level. It needs to happen at the local level. We do not need the Federal Government to get involved. It is not the proper role for the Federal Government. This work is going on where it

needs to take place and where constitutionally it should take place, which is at the State and local level.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment and agree with my colleague from California that we need to have a national debate about how to improve education, and it is not by making the Federal Government get more involved, it is by diminishing the role of the Federal Government and unleashing innovation at the State and local level.

We have seen innovation and we have seen schools, parents and kids that are excelling, but it is when the Federal Government has stepped back and where we have enabled young people and where we have enabled the local governments to take control.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 90 minutes, to be divided 45 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and 45 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

□ 1930

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ETHERIDGE].

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be very brief and maybe set out a few quick points, if I may. We have been talking about tests. And the last time I checked, math is pretty much math anywhere in this country. I state that having been State superintendent, elected by the people in the State of North Carolina for two consecutive 4-year terms.

Reading is something that every child needs to know. It is the foundation of all learning. And we are really talking about testing that in fourth and eighth grade, and we are talking about a voluntary test. This is voluntary. It is not mandatory.

The other point I would make, Mr. Chairman, is that when we are talking about these issues, we are talking about the fundamental issues of education.

Let me very quickly talk about my State for just a moment. In North Carolina we became a part of the National Assessment of Education Progress, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] talked about that a few moments ago. That does not require a national curriculum. States can elect to be a part of it, and 45 States in this Nation have participated.

I would say to my colleagues that North Carolina has volunteered to be one of the six States, and we will be a part of any national test that is put in place. But I want to talk about the National Assessment of Education

Progress for just a moment and why it is important to have some standard, because I happen to believe in high standards for our children so that all children can gain and do well.

North Carolina has been a leader of that over the last several years, and here is why: No other State in this country has experienced the sustained gains demonstrated by North Carolina schools since 1990. Today, North Carolina's public schools are performing well above other schools anywhere in this country, and let me tell my colleagues why.

When tests were taken this year on NAEP, in 1996, North Carolina gained 17 points in eighth grade mathematics for the 6 years reported by NAEP. That is twice the national average, which happened to have been eight points for all the other States in the Nation, and approximately 50 percent higher than the gain of any other State in the Nation.

The State's average performance was just short of the national average. Why? Because we started right at the bottom. Why did we grow so fast? Because we had standards, we measured them, and every single school knew it. We gave our teachers the resources, and they performed admirably. And so did our students.

North Carolina students have improved the equivalent of one full grade level during the decade of the nineties. In other words, an eighth grade student in 1996 was one full year ahead of eighth grade students in 1990. So in little over 6 years, right at 6 years, they gained a full grade level in elementary grade.

North Carolina's fourth and eighth grade African-American students were five points ahead of African-American students nationally. Why? Because we measured, we put the resources there, and it makes a difference. If it does not make a difference to assess and measure, then why do we do it in other things? Why do we keep the score of a basketball player or football player? It is important to let people know where they are and put the resources and make a difference.

I close by reminding my colleagues that we are talking about voluntary tests, we are talking about reading and mathematics, and it is time that we get away from the rhetoric of who is in charge and let the American people know that we mean to have high standards and we are going to make sure that our children can compete with any children anywhere in the world.

Secretary Riley said, when the tests were released this spring, if we look at the States that are on the way up, States like North Carolina, Michigan, Maryland, and Kentucky, I say it does make a difference to measure. It makes a difference to let children know what we want. And that is why I oppose this amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], chairman of the

Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families from the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for yielding me the time.

I say to my colleagues, this has been an interesting debate, although one that seems to have a foregone conclusion, interesting in the sense that it clearly crosses party lines. I want to say at the outset that I hope this debate does not become another political football. I would hope that this kind of debate would occur at the local level, at a local school board meeting in every community around the country, because I think it is real important for those local communities to have a debate regarding the standards and expectations for children that attend schools within that community. But that is really what we are talking about tonight.

I do also want to preface my remarks by saying I believe the President and his administration are well-intentioned in this regard. I think their proposal may be somewhat flawed, but I think the President was right to stand up here behind us and give his State of the Union Address to the Congress and the country in February of this year and talk about the problem of social promotion, this idea that too often our children are advanced from grade to grade or even graduated as much on the basis of good behavior and time served as on the basis of what they know and what they can demonstrate they have learned during their public school years.

I think the President is right to talk about replacing this problem of social promotion with a competency-based advancement system in our schools. But the question really, though, goes to the fundamental issue in American education, and that is: Who is going to design that system of competency-based advancement?

And I submit to my colleagues that it is the responsibility, it is the obligation of the State and local education agencies to design that system. That is very much in keeping, as I have said over and over on this floor, with the long-standing American tradition of decentralized decisionmaking and local control in public education.

Clearly, though, we ought to have high expectations and high standards for all of our children. One out of four high school graduates are functionally illiterate. American students lagging internationally. Unacceptably high dropout rates. In fact, if one child falls through the cracks, much less an entire generation of urban schoolchildren, we have a problem. Too many high school graduates going into our colleges and universities in need of remedial education, defined as not being able to learn at the eighth grade level. Something has gone awry in schools if that is the case.

So I do encourage States, such as my home State of California, such as the State of Virginia, to establish uniform standards for pupil performance so parents have a basis for knowing how all schools within that State are really performing. That makes, to me, very good sense.

As the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee, I want to tell my colleagues I support the Goodling amendment, in part because every time we have a debate about testing, we raise more questions than answers.

In fact, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], one of our very distinguished colleagues, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, sent around a "Dear Colleague" citing four reasons to support the Goodling testing amendment, including no authorization. And clearly now, I say to my colleagues, let us be real clear on one point, and that is, if we are going to expand the NAEP, this random sampling of pupil performance, in 43 of the 50 States to include producing individual test scores, that goes beyond, that exceeds the current statutory authorization for the NAEP. So, no authorization.

Second, the department's testing proposal bypass Congress. And as the chairman said, it just makes good sense to consult the elected representatives of the people when talking about something the magnitude of national testing.

Third, there is real grassroots opposition. There are local concerns regarding the idea of voluntary national testing in many communities around the country, not least of which is that it may cause the States and local communities inadvertently to have to lower the bar in this whole area of standards and expectations.

Lastly, there are again these fundamental questions regarding the President's testing proposal, such as what is the purpose of the test; what is the need, as the chairman said, for yet another set of tests; will the test undermine State and local curriculum assessments; and will these tests, bottom line now, ultimately improve pupil performance?

So that is the message I wanted to convey tonight. I do want to urge, as the subcommittee chairman, State and local school districts to improve public education by raising academic standards, by increasing and, yes, enforcing graduation requirements for all students. Maryland is looking at doing that same thing now and holding schools accountable for poor student performance.

Again, this is very consistent with the long-standing American tradition of decentralized decisionmaking in public education. And in keeping with that tradition, it is those local elected decisionmakers, those school board members who are accountable to their constituents, to their neighbors, to their family and friends in that community, the people who put them in of-

fice as school board members, it is those local school board members who should consider adopting and implementing rigorous standards in the core academic subjects and allowing the students to study in school with their testing. That would be a way that parents can see how all students are really performing.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], a longtime member of the committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendment. I do so and I find it rather interesting that we have so many Members coming out onto the floor and saying that what we have got to do is abide by local control and local decisions, and yet this amendment would not allow some 15 major cities in this country and a number of States that have made the decision that they want to use the NAEP for the purposes described in the President's program, this amendment would prohibit them from doing that.

States of Alaska; Kentucky; Maryland; Massachusetts; Michigan; North Carolina; West Virginia; not exactly the hotbeds of a Federal takeover of education; Atlanta, Georgia; Broward County, FL; El Paso, TX; Fresno, CA; Long Beach, CA; Omaha; New York City; Philadelphia; San Antonio would like to use NAEP. They believe in this product. They would like to use it for this purpose, but this amendment will not allow them to do that.

So, it is not quite the level of local control that people would have us believe. They would have the Federal Government keep those local jurisdictions from using this.

But the fact of the matter is, let us take a look at it. Both sides and political leaders of both parties have gotten up, and very often do it in June when we are talking about students who are graduating from high school and cannot read their diploma, most of those students were tested with State tests. Most of those students got a C average or D average or something to get that high school diploma. But there was a bit of a fraud perpetrated on the student and on the family. And that is that somehow this student was performing to standards that were worthy of the diploma and was prepared to go on to the rest of American society, whether that is to work, or training, or education, or what have you.

What, in fact, we see is a lot of students take State tests; and then when we assess them against the NAEP, huge numbers of those students that looked like they were performing very well on the State tests do terribly on the tough tests of the NAEP.

The fact of the matter is that in the last 4 or 5 years American parents and communities have decided to reengage their education system. America has

decided that if, in fact, it is going to compete, it is going to have to revalue education; that we have been letting it slide too long for our children, we have not asked enough of our children, we have not set the standards high enough, we have not recognized what they were able to, in fact, achieve. We simply let them muddle through. But parents now understand that muddling through is not good enough if their children are going to be able to actively participate in the American economy and in the world economy and as productive members of our society.

In fact, in California what we now see is a change in terms of what local communities are doing in terms of the reinvestment of their tax dollars into the public system. In almost an unprecedented rate, bond issue after bond issue that must be passed by two-thirds vote is passing in our State because people have decided that they are going to reinvest in this public system. For all of the horror stories that they have been told about it, they still decide that that is where they want to make the investment.

I would think that they would want the NAEP test so they can decide how they are doing, how they are doing alongside of North Carolina, which is achieving changes in its educational achievement and attainment that many States would envy. They would like to know how they are doing against Massachusetts or Alaska or Maryland. Is what they are doing now and the investments that they are making, the new investments in technology, the new investments in physical plants and equipment and teacher training, is that paying off? Are they headed in the right direction with their curriculum?

That is the standard that NAEP would provide them to make those kinds of comparisons. They do not want to do that? Nothing in the law says they have to do that. They do not want to participate in that comparison? They do not have to. They do not want their children to take the test? They do not have to.

But what, in fact, we are seeing is, we are seeing local school districts coming forward, asking to be able to participate, and we are seeing States saying they would like to participate. And somehow the Congress cannot find it quite right that these people have made an informed judgment, that they have made a good determination, what is good for their State or what is good for their school district, to participate in this. We have decided what we will substitute our judgment at the Federal level and they cannot participate in this program.

□ 1945

I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has been on both sides of this issue, and so have I. I pushed very hard for opportunity-to-learn standards so we would make

sure that resources would accommodate testing. But I also think that testing is a road map and is a guidance for communities as to whether or not they are getting shortchanged in some manner or fashion in those school districts.

It also lets communities and school boards know where resources ought to be allocated, because all of those things are true today without the NAEP. It is all true today, the misallocation of resources, misallocations of talented teachers, roofs that leak and all the rest of it. NAEP is not going to cause that to happen. It is happening today. But it may very well provide a blueprint and a guideline and an assessment as to how these renewed efforts that are going on all over our country as people are reinvesting billions and billions of their local tax dollars back into the public education system in this country.

This is a chance for them to determine whether or not they are making not only a wise decision, but the right decision. I happen to think they are making the right decision. But they need to know as to whether or not their local efforts are paying off on behalf of those students.

But the heavy hand of the Federal Government apparently tonight is going to decide that they will not even be able to do that. If they vote at the local level, if they vote at the district level, if they vote at the school level or if they vote at the State level, the Federal Government tonight will decide that that will not happen.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], a member of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. I just wanted to point out that after intense lobbying by the administration, only seven of those States decided to participate. After intense lobbying by the administration over months, only fifteen cities out of thousands have decided to participate. Intense lobbying, I might add.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for having the guts to say nationally what people locally are saying about national testing.

In my district, I presented a flag to a local elementary school. We talked very glowingly about what the flag meant and how much we should honor and respect it. The one thing that I left with that meeting was that there are good, polite kids at that school, and every teacher was following this debate, and every administrator was following this debate and said, please do not impose upon us another testing regime. Give us some assets to implement the changes we need to make in South Carolina to improve education.

If you are a taxpayer out there channel flipping, you might want to stop for a minute. This debate involves your money. It is going to take \$15 to \$16 million to design the tests. In the year 1999, it is going to take \$90 to \$100 million to administer the tests. That is a lot of money. At least I think it is a lot of money.

The question you ought to be asking is take a few minutes to go to your local education board, to your superintendent, to your teachers, and write your State representative and ask those folks what are we doing in our State right now to test our students, and see if that suffices. This really is about power. If you do not have an agenda, you ought not be in this place. My agenda is clearly to take the education debate and get it home and get as much resources into the hands of a teacher who knows the child's name and less resources here in Washington.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The gentleman will direct his comments to the Chair and not to an audience.

Mr. GRAHAM. Strike what I said, Mr. Chairman, and I will make it to the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, what I would suggest that everybody in the country do is do what I just said a few minutes ago. Take some time to find out how much money is being spent at the local level and see if this \$100 million program does any good, or if we should take the \$100 million and give it to the classroom teacher who will actually meet their child every day and see if it will help produce a better result.

Let me tell my colleagues politically where we are. The State has already voted on this. They decided not to give the Department of Education the ability to fashion the test. It passed in the Senate, but there is going to be a Washington-picked group that will design the test.

One reason I think the Black Caucus and the Hispanic Caucus is against this is they do not want some elite group in Washington designing a test for their children, not knowing anything about their community, and creating standards that may not be appropriate for their community.

If you give the power to test, you are eventually going to give the power to change curriculum. It has traditionally been in America a local function to test and prepare students to learn. A local teacher will show up in your classroom, somebody that lives in your community, who will probably see you Friday night at the ballgame. Would it not be nice to be able to talk to that teacher and tell her or him that, I support you and your endeavors to educate my child, and I am against giving more money in Washington, DC to do the job that you are capable of? That is what this debate is about.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has got a lot of guts. He

is willing to take the feel-good 30-second, 60-second sound bites and fight for values. I think his agenda is what most people's agenda in the education business is. Give me more of the assets available in education, and I will do a better job. A dollar spent here in Washington will not do what a dime spent in a classroom in South Carolina will do.

Let us take the money, the desires, hopes and dreams we have for our children and put it in the hands of the people who will actually meet the child day in and day out, and do not buy into the dream that Washington knows best. If you want to send your kid to a Washington, DC school system, come up here and go. You would not stay here 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5¾ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendment. I am from one of those States apparently that was intensely lobbied. We did not need to be. As the gentleman from North Carolina has mentioned, we believe that assessing performance is critical if we are going to achieve excellence, if we are going to have expectations of our school system, of our students, of our teachers and of our system.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendment because I believe it is a crucial part of preparing our children for the next century to have a national assessment available to local States and local education agencies. Available is the key word; not imposed, but available, at their option, voluntary, as everybody has noted.

The funds provided for in this bill will support the implementation of voluntary national tests. States and local districts will have the opportunity to participate in the tests, but the tests are not mandatory. No Federal funds will be withheld if a State or district does not choose to participate. It seems to me the proponents of the Goodling amendment ignore that fact and just suppose that somehow it will turn into being mandatory.

Parents, Mr. Chairman, deserve, having spent their hard-earned money and invested in their school systems, to know how their children are performing based on rigorous standards no matter where they live in this country. The chairman of the subcommittee spoke. The gentleman is from a State of 32 million people. One-ninth of America lives in his State, one-eighth or one-ninth of America lives in his State, so it is very nice to say, well, we will have this State standard, larger than most nations or many nations of the world.

National tests, Mr. Chairman, will provide parents with the information they must have to determine if their children are on track in obtaining the knowledge and skills needed in a global society, not needed in South Carolina, not needed in California, not needed in Maryland. Our young people will compete in a global marketplace. They

need to be ready, as this country needs to be ready.

In my State of Maryland, as has been mentioned, national tests will serve as an enhancement to the rigorous assessment program already in place. Why do we have it in place? Because our citizens have demanded that we use their money effectively. All of us, and particularly the majority party, has talked about spending taxpayers' money effectively. How do you know that? By osmosis? I suggest not. You have got to find out, and you have got to tell parents, are your children getting what you are paying for? This is the way to find out.

Since the implementation of this program in Maryland, Mr. Chairman, test scores have continued to climb, dropout rates have dropped significantly, and attendance rates have risen. I hope that everybody listens to that, because that is exactly what the gentleman from North Carolina said was the result in his State of these tests.

The American public supports, I tell my colleagues, high national standards. According to a national education survey, 84 percent of voters favor establishing meaningful standards for what students should be expected to learn in skills such as reading and math. And 77 percent of those surveyed favor national reading and math tests. Why? Because they know their children are going to compete with the young people from California and Florida and New York and Maryland and Mississippi, and they want them to be able to do so, because they know it is crucial for them and for their families' welfare as well as the welfare of our Nation.

The American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the National School Boards Association and the Council of Chiefs of State Schools Officers all endorse voluntary national tests and oppose the Goodling amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when expectations are raised, students rise to meet them. I hope that we oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there was a book written by Jonathan Kozol some years ago. The title of that book was "Death at an Early Age." The premise of that book was that we do not have high expectations of some young people, minority young people, educationally deprived young people, economically deprived young people, and because we do not have high expectations that they will perform, they meet those expectations. They are low ones. But if we had a way to assess all of our students, then their parents would know that our expectations were not high enough for their children or that our performance in getting them to our expectations were not successful. In either event, parents, communities, States and, yes, this Nation ought to know, are we preparing our young people to compete in a global marketplace.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from

California [Mr. RIGGS] will control the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

There was no objection.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to briefly observe that what this debate is about is whether national testing is a proper role for the Federal Government. As a former Governor himself, as a former head of the National Governors Association, the President should realize that he is intruding on what is historically a State and local responsibility. In fact, just last March at a summit in Palisades, NY, the Nation's Governors and prominent business leaders reconfirmed their commitment to developing State standards and State assessments in their own States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], the distinguished majority whip of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and those that have brought this amendment because I rise in support of this common-sense amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

We do not need the Federal Government and national organizations getting involved in our local school districts. There are many problems with our educational system. Parents need more choices when it comes to sending their children to primary and secondary schools. We had a proposal that would have given parents greater opportunities to make these choices, but the President turned it down. Clearly the President was frightened by the power of the teachers' union, and I think that is a shame. We do not need to legislate merely to please the teachers' union. We should legislate to improve the quality of our children's education.

This amendment says that we should not waste our precious resources by identifying problems through more tests administered by Washington bureaucrats. We know the problems. Our kids are not getting the kind of quality education that they need to compete into the next century. We do not need a national test to figure that out. We need to improve our schools by promoting competition and by giving parents more choices to provide better opportunities for their kids. We need to move our precious resources out of Washington and away from the NEA and other national associations and send those resources to our schools where they belong.

□ 2000

Let us send a signal to this administration: Improve our schools, not our tests.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of the Goodling amendment. As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and someone who wants all children to achieve the highest standards of learning, I am reluctantly opposing the administration's current national testing proposal in its current format.

The goals and intentions behind the proposal are excellent, to enable States, schools, and students on a voluntary basis to see how they are doing relative to other State schools and students. At its best, this can spur reform efforts and help target resources where they are most needed. The tests can also provide one indicator of how successful local reform efforts are.

Unfortunately, this proposal has been poorly managed and executed, and consequently has not gained adequate support from families, educators, the States, or Congress.

My home State of Delaware recently implemented world class education standards. These standards were not developed at the top level and presented to educators and parents as a done deal. These standards were the product of extensive discussion and feedback from all parties at the local and State level. Consequently, when the standards were complete, there was widespread, although not universal, support for them.

I believe this serves as a model for how testing should be developed at the national level. Instead, the administration's national testing proposal was developed in a top-down manner at the Education Department without adequate input from Congress and State and local educators.

National standards in testing are issues we should address in a cooperative and coordinated manner. The administration's proposal has gotten off on the wrong foot, and we should go back to square one. The Senate has developed a reasonable compromise, and I hope we in the House can work with the Senate in conference to provide some guidance to the administration about how to revise the testing proposal.

Among other things, the Senate has done the following: Reaffirmed the voluntary nature of the national test; given the National Assessment Governing Board exclusive authority over all policies, direction and guidelines for establishing the tests; provided that the National Assessment Governing Board has authority and responsibility over any activities already begun by the Department of Education and has 90 days to review any contracts; directed the National Assessment Governing Board to ensure that the content and standards for the national tests shall be the same as those to the National Assessment for Educational Progress, which is widely respected, as we have heard on the floor tonight; changed the composition of the 25-

member National Assessment Governing Board to ensure it is truly bipartisan and independent; and reasserts the independence of the National Assessment Governing Board from the Department of Education.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this compromise has potential. As Governor of Delaware, I had the opportunity to serve on the National Assessment Governing Board, which is the organization of State officials, educators, and parents that work with the Department of Education on national policy to improve educational standards and assess the educational progress of our children.

I am supportive of increasing the involvement of the National Assessment Governing Board as a good way to involve Governors, local elected officials, business and industry representatives, as well as educators and parents, in the development and oversight of the tests. So while I support the Goodling amendment, I reiterate my hope that the House will work with the Senate on its compromise, and I will work to create a compromise we can all support.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to a strong Federal role in education. The Federal Government should be a partner with local schools, parents, and our States in improving the education we provide to our children. However, the Federal Government cannot dictate policy. Standards and tests must have the input and support of everyone who cares about education, including parents, teachers, administrators, and State officials. The current administration proposal does not do this, and, thus, I support the Goodling amendment to prevent it from moving forward until it is revised.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, because I cannot understand the reasoning behind denying communities across the country the opportunity to engage in a voluntary system, a system which will enable them to more accurately test their students to see if they are doing well.

This is not, as some have suggested, about establishing a national curriculum. After all, math and reading are part of every curriculum. It is about testing for those two subjects. These are the two critical parts of every curriculum. If a student cannot participate in math and do math well, they are not going to succeed very well in society. If they cannot read and use language arts very well, they are not going to succeed in society. That is what this program is all about.

The President is offering communities across the country the opportunity to participate voluntarily so they can judge and test whether or not their students are making progress, so that they can compete more effectively throughout the school system on into higher education and then on into the economy.

Some have said that testing establishes a stigma. Well, what kind of stigma is worse than the stigma of not being able to do simple mathematics, or what kind of stigma is worse than the stigma of not being able to read and write, to be able to communicate properly?

That kind of stigma is a real stigma, one that prevents people from participating in the economic system in a fair and just way, prevents them from getting jobs and taking care of their families.

Testing will simply measure the progress that is being made. It is not something that the administration is trying to force on anyone. They are simply offering it. If you want to participate in it, you may. If you want to establish your own statewide tests, you certainly may do that and leave this one alone.

If you want to establish different tests for different communities, do that, if you like, within your States. But if you want a national test that is available to you, which will enable you to see whether or not your students are keeping pace with others in other parts of the country so when they get older and as they move to other parts of the country, and, indeed, to other parts of the world, they will be able to compete effectively with those students who are educated in other places, that simply is what is at stake here.

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot understand why we should be opposed to giving communities the opportunity to allow students to find out more about themselves and about the progress they are making through the educational system. That is what this test does, and we ought to reject the amendment therefore.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODE], a new Member of the body.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman Goodling for this amendment and for his leadership on this issue. During the recent August recess and during the last two weekends, I have talked with area school superintendents from across Virginia's 5th district. I have talked to school administrators, with teachers, with students and with the parents and with citizens, and there is widespread opposition to any national test.

Recently Cheri Yecke, a member of the Virginia State Board of Education, also spoke out against the national test. We do not want a commission, we do not want an appointed body, we do not want a board making the decision on a national test. We believe that a national test decision should be by elected Representatives of the United States Congress, and I am glad to see the bipartisan opposition to a national test, and I hope we can kill this snake today overwhelmingly on the floor of this body.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three and a half minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT].

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate my remarks with those of my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODE]. Certainly we are talking ultimately about a national test, a national test that will lead to a national curriculum. Anybody who is going to be regulated by this national test, who has ever been in the classroom, knows that eventually you have to make efforts to respond to the test. You do not exactly have to teach the test, but you certainly move in that direction, and that leads in the direction of a national curriculum at the elementary and secondary level.

This is not a good way to spend \$50 million. There are good ways to spend \$50 million that encourage education. This is not a good way to do that. The States are already doing this job. Forty-seven States are in the process of adopting State assessment vehicles through testing, through monitoring, through grading of how efforts are being made in schools. Forty-seven of 50 states are already doing this job. I think it needs to be done at the State and the community level.

In fact, education tests need to be really developed from the bottom up, not from the top down. The closer you get to where kids leave home to go to school, the closer you need to be to their house where that test is developed.

For four years, Mr. Chairman, I was the president of a university, and during that entire four years we talked about whether or not the national tests at the university level were adequate vehicles to measure how students were going to do in college. The SAT, the ACT tests were constantly being criticized because of their inability to really measure how people were doing or how people were going to do. And this is not to attack those tests, privately developed, well-used, indicators, I think, of what can happen at the college level. But, remember, the people taking those tests were people who had gone to school 11 or 12 years, people who intended to go to college, people who should by that time have had some commonality of what they were talking about in terms of how you measure those skills. People at the third grade level generally do not have yet a national perspective. They do not have that at the eighth grade level. They may not even quite have that at the 11th and 12th grade level when they are now taking all kinds of national tests that really frankly do not measure people's ability to compete in higher education as effectively as we would like.

A national test for elementary school does not make sense. Government involvement in testing at the Federal level does not make sense. We have handled that well in higher education with privately developed tests. The States are handling that well by encouraging local school districts to develop tests.

Remember, geography comes into how you take this test. Where you live

comes into how you take this test. Let us not try to act like that by the third grade, American students become so homogenized that they can react to a national test, because they cannot.

It will be misleading, it will be a misservice to parts of the country. There is no way you can develop this test so that it adequately measures fairly children all over America. Of course, children all over America I think is what motivates both sides here.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the Goodling amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PASCARELL].

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to those who oppose national testing. They have attempted to claim that the new national test will lead to a national curriculum. They argue that the tests are really just another intrusion into education by the Federal Government and an attempt by Washington to usurp control of education on the State and local level.

Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Chairman. The establishment of a reading test for fourth graders and a math test for eighth graders is not an attempt to create a national curriculum. The tests are meant only to serve as a way of ensuring that students all over America are receiving the type of education they deserve.

We are not talking here about history or interpretive studies. We are talking about the very basic skills needed to survive in America today, reading and math. That has nothing to do with history; it has nothing to do with revisionism. It has to do with the very basic skills that we need to survive. These tests are based on generally accepted standards that students should know.

As a former local official and as a mayor, I recognize the importance of keeping control of education at the local level. I support national testing because it assists local school boards in States to measure how well they are doing their job without undermining their ability.

I have heard others argue that we should be dedicating greater resources to improving our schools and then to the classroom. I agree with that premise. I do not, however, believe the two are mutually exclusive. In fact, national testing will provide us with a better picture of where we need to better target our resources.

Let me be clear on this issue: National tests will improve the education that our students receive by providing parents and educators with the knowledge of how their students' individual achievements rank in comparison to widely respected national-international standards by an independent commission of educators and scholars, not the Federal Government.

□ 2015

National tests will focus attention on the need to improve basic skills. The tests will provide teachers and parents and students a very clear picture of where students should be in their education at specific points. This picture will help guide parents and teachers.

Mr. Chairman, there are those in the Congress, many of my good friends, who oppose these tests on the grounds that they fear that children in underfunded school districts will fail at a higher than average rate. I understand that fear, but believe that these tests actually make the argument for the tests.

The tests will serve as proof that we need to better direct our funding, and direct and provide a guide for which districts are most in need of funding, and our children can compete. To say that tests are simply going to prove failure is absolutely wrong. We send the wrong message to those children. As a former educator, I think it is insulting to those kids if we say, "The more we test you, the more we will know you fail." That is wrong, that is absurd. There is no science to back that up.

In the end, we must understand that we do not live in 50 different bubbles, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] pointed out.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to briefly respond and point out to the gentleman, as we have already said on this floor this evening, only 7 of the 50 States have said that they will participate in these tests, which begs the question, if these tests are so essential to the education of our children and to gauging and assessing the progress of our children, if these tests are so essential in that regard, it would seem that more States would already be on board.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], for yielding me this time.

I rise to speak in support of the Goodling amendment. I do so even with the understanding that reading and arithmetic are the base fundamentals of the development of any educational program. However, I rise to speak in favor of this amendment because I am concerned about a national testing program because of the differences and variations in our society. I am not sure that when we measure and how we use that data, that it will not be used in such a manner that it is not designed to point out the needs that really exist.

If we want to improve education, what we really need to do is galvanize our communities so that people believe that education is essential to making it. Once again, I would be in favor of a national testing program if we had a national funding program, if we had a national resource development pro-

gram, if we had a national training program so that we could train, inspire and motivate teachers to give their best.

So when that time comes, then I would be in favor of a national testing program. But until then, I believe it makes more sense to make greater use of those resources, to find a way to equalize educational opportunity by finding ways to bring equity to school systems throughout this Nation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY].

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendment.

Throughout this Congress we have had a lot of discussion about an increasing concern across this Nation about the growing differential in wages, the growing differential between the wealthy and those who are somewhat more impoverished.

When I look at what the potential for voluntary testing provides, I think more than anything else it is going to ensure that all of our children are going to have the same opportunities to succeed. Because what we are talking about here more than anything else is how do we empower students, how do we empower parents, how do we empower our educational institutions as well as our communities?

By giving them information on how students and how schools are performing, whether it be in Hanford, CA, or Waco, TX, or Boston, MA, we are going to allow parents to understand whether or not their children are gaining the proficiency in such basic subjects which are critical to their success.

When I talk about the growing wage differential, what is absolutely critical is that when we look at the potential lifetime earnings of any individual, the greatest determinant is the level of education they receive. When we look at what institutions our children are going to be able to get into, oftentimes it is their ability to perform well on college entrance exams. And unfortunately, all too often, some children coming from some areas that might not necessarily be getting the level of academic training that they need, are not being accepted into these higher levels of academic institutions.

What the voluntary testing will allow, it will allow that parent and those schools to gain a greater understanding of whether or not they need to be doing a better job, whether or not they ought to be making some improvements in the way they are trying to educate their children and how they make them more proficient in reading. We are going to be doing a better job in giving schools and again parents the information they need to know, whether or not they ought to be doing something and trying to define some of the basic math skills which are critical to an individual's future success.

Mr. Chairman, I think the administration has put together a terrific program that would allow again the information which is critical to the future success of a child to be known through this voluntary national test program. These are some things that are going to allow the greatest influence to be utilized at the local level, and more than anything else it will give the information to parents so they can make the decisions, so that they can play a major role in the success of their children.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON], a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Goodling amendment. The reason we are here discussing this issue tonight is that Johnny and Suzie cannot read as well as they should, and Suzie and Johnny do not do mathematics, they do not add, multiply, subtract and divide as well as they need to, many of them. So that is why we are discussing this tonight.

I ask my colleagues, do we really think a national test will help Johnny read and Suzie do math? Do we really think it will make a difference?

What are some of the problems that we are facing in basic education today? Parental involvement, helping Johnny and Suzie read and do math. Will a test change that? I do not think so. Discipline in the schools, to help Johnny and Suzie read and do math. Will a national test change that? I do not think so.

National and State bureaucracies which chew up our administrators and principals' time, if my colleagues have ever walked through a school, how often do they really get into the classroom? They tell me by the time they get the State and Federal paperwork done, the day is over. They do not have time to get into the classroom like they need to. If my colleagues have ever walked through a State bureaucracy, they are very busy. Ninety percent of the bureaucracy is caused by the Federal Government which gives 6 percent of the money.

Do we reward good teachers? Oh, no, that is not cool, that is not appropriate, to reward good teachers. Will national testing help there? No. Is funding fair and equal in all of our schools? Absolutely not. We have schools that spend 2 and 3 times as much per student as others. Will national testing change that? National testing will not change that. Is the classroom size equal from school to school? No, it is not equal, and national testing will not change that.

We will add another layer of bureaucracy. We will have a Federal bureaucracy, we will have a State bureaucracy in 50 States, regional bureaucracies and local bureaucracies administering tests. One hundred million dollars to set it up and approximately that much

at the Federal level to administer it thereafter, plus the unmeasured costs at the State and local level that never gets figured into the mix.

National testing will not change education, I say to my colleagues. We would be far better off to spend that \$100 million getting at one of the problems I have mentioned, but a test will give us a couple more years to observe, we will hire some more employees for the Federal and State governments to build the educational bureaucracy.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], our chairman, is right on the ball, he is right on the money. National testing is not the answer. It will not change a thing. It will give a few people a few jobs, but it will not help Johnny and Suzie read and it will not help Suzie and Johnny do multiplication, add and subtract.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to some of the debate, I have gotten the impression that many of my colleagues feel that any amount of testing is not worthwhile, and I think we need sort of a reevaluation of what testing is all about. Obviously we spend hundreds of millions of dollars on testing elementary and secondary students today across this country. The question is, do we have a good measurement instrument in terms of making that assessment? Is it valid, is it reliable?

The fact is, I think the real genius of this administration, of this particular proposal, lies in first of all setting some national standards for reading and math. There is an area I think where there is not great controversy. Setting national standards for that is I think of paramount importance; and then, attempting to measure. We cannot have standards unless we know how we are going to assess whether we attain them.

I would submit to my colleagues that testing of course is paramount to that. We cannot tell by the color of the hair of the student or other extrinsic factors that one might look at in terms of making that determination. One can only do that with a valid and reliable measurement instrument, and that is what we are about in terms of this particular case.

We have a lot of private sector companies today developing tests. I do not know if they are all valid and reliable; I doubt very much that they are. I think there are a lot of questions being raised about cultural bias and other things in testing, and the question is, why are we doing this type of testing?

One of my colleagues mentioned we test the 12th grade to see if they can get into the Air Force, the military academies; we give them various scores, all very interesting. However, the one thing that I think most of the parents would come to us in terms of

suggesting at the end of the 12 years of elementary and secondary education is, "Why did you not tell me that something was happening where a student could not read or could not do math? Why did you not let me know? We used to get it after just one semester. Why did you not tell me so I could do something about it?"

The fact is that that is what these tests are aimed at, the fourth grade, reading and math, eighth grade, reading and math, to let them know, to give some feedback.

A test as a measurement instrument has an ability to communicate. It tells us and gives us information that we can use, that we can evaluate what is being done in the elementary and secondary schools across this Nation.

I will tell my colleagues, when we look at the billions of dollars being spent, and I frankly very much support the increased budgets in education at the national level and the compensatory education, and I urge my colleagues to do so, but we are spending those billions of dollars and we have a responsibility to also try and include some evaluation measurement instruments so we can communicate back some of the internal type of dynamics that work.

Yes, testing will improve achievement and testing will tell us what is happening, and as I pointed out, we live in such a mobile society today that many individuals that come from other States or from my colleagues' States, come from my State, Minnesota or others. I urge opposition of the amendment.

□ 2030

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, another gentleman from the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refute the arguments of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] who just spoke. I have a lot that I find that I like about Minnesota, one of which is an author and a storyteller named Garrison Keillor, who writes about a mythical town in Minnesota called Lake Wobegone. He talks about Lake Wobegone, where all the children are above average, all the children are above average.

If Members are inspired by that particular statement, that particular comment, I would suggest that they really would want to embrace national testing, because that is what they will get. They will get 50 States where all children are above average.

Let me suggest, the gentleman who said that those who favor the Goodling amendment, as I do, and hope we have support here today, that this amendment would deny States the opportunity to participate in voluntary testing, I would suggest this debate is not about national testing. It is not about testing at all, and it is not about the value of testing.

What it is, though, is about whether we should embrace a government-owned test versus an independent test. States around this country realize the value of independent testing, testing that is outside of the U.S. Department of Education, that is not controlled and dominated by Federal bureaucrats who are rewarded when they treat all States and all students as though they are somehow all above average.

Members of my State board of education told me that they did not want the government-owned national testing program. Other State legislators and leaders in the areas of schools told me the same. Local school leaders told me the same thing.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, there was a meeting here in Washington about this national testing program. It was a meeting of the national test panel which is organizing this effort. The National Governors Association did not show up because they have withdrawn from the effort. State after State after State is coming to the conclusion that when we come here tonight, that this national testing effort is a bad, bad idea, and that the Goodling amendment ought to be passed; that \$100 million a year to support this nonsense is something we should not do. We should redirect those dollars directly toward children, not toward more bureaucracy and more administration.

A government-engineered national test, I will submit, is the most direct pathway to mediocrity in America. It is an idea that we should reject, and we should reject it tonight by voting in favor of the Goodling amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND].

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I was listening with great attention to some of my colleagues on the other side, and I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendment. Like many Members have said this evening, testing will not solve many of the ills of our educational system.

In my district, I have some very diverse areas of education. In part of my district I have the most affluent district or section of our State. SAT scores are the highest, income level is the highest, and the schools are phenomenal. I also have the poorest section of our State, where over 75 percent of the students are minority. Over 40 percent of the students in the last 3 years did not live in the United States of America. It is very difficult for education in that area.

But testing is extremely important. Remember when we went to school, we went to college and we took those SAT scores. They always scared us, but we had to take them because that was the only tool that educators could use to evaluate whether we were capable of getting into college. It is a national test, the SAT's.

Just 2 weeks ago I dropped off my youngest child to college, and I worried

whether he was going to be able to make the test. Was he going to be able to pass all the things that he needed to do in college? Because I was concerned whether he really had all of the kinds of tools from the school system he came from to be in college.

Every one of us lives up to three basic things in life. We set standards, we have assessments or testing, and then there is accountability afterward. Every educational system from kindergarten to graduate studies has the same three elements. Yet we are saying this evening that we do not even want to begin to consider assessments or testing on a national level? That is completely wrong, and completely opposite of what we have all learned.

The poor districts will argue, well, maybe our students will not bear up with national testing. I say that is what we should be doing is to help them with regard to more money, more teacher training, and more professional development, and the kind of assistance and infrastructure that they need. But we should not disregard testing, because, quite frankly, that is the only vehicle that we have to be sure our students in all districts, rich and poor, make the grade.

Testing is what we call tough love. It is difficult. We often do not like to do it, but we have to go through it if we are going to raise the standard of quality education in our States and in our districts. Quite frankly, those of us who believe in it have seen the merit of it. As a former professor, I know that it works. As former teachers, all of us know it works.

Quite frankly, we are a little bit edgy about the concept of national testing. Local cities and towns felt the same way about State testing, and local neighborhoods felt the same way about city- and townwide testing. Quite frankly, we have to live with it. We should live with it. It will make our students better. It will make our children better. It is tough love, but we should be doing it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], the subcommittee chairman on our committee.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and commend him for his leadership and the work he has done to bring us to this point on this debate.

The gentleman's amendment would prohibit funds under this bill from being used by the Clinton administration for a new Federal testing program in grades four to eight. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that our K-12 education system needs reform and attention, but an arbitrary new Federal testing system is not the answer nor the cure-all.

There are already a number of tests that continue to be administered. In fact, in 1997 the Federal Government spent approximately \$540 million in testing students. The question is, when you have a test, what do you test? I think we have heard the administration talk about when you have a test, you have to have standards. The question is, who sets the standards? If you have a Federal test, I guess it would be the Federal Government setting the standards. What is the next step?

I spent 9 years on a local school board. My wife was a PTA president. We have reared six children. We have 15 grandchildren. We have real concerns about the Federal Government setting their standards and setting testing. The administration now wants to move forward and implement new testing without input or authorization from Congress. As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I, along with my committee colleagues, would like the opportunity to evaluate and study any such proposal.

I encourage my colleagues to support the prohibition of this new, unauthorized Federal testing proposal. Let us do what local school boards are asking. Let us take some of the Federal regulation off of their backs. Some of the testing that we now have let us take off of their backs. Let us let them be free to do the things that are best for children. That is what our children need to move forward.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendment, with the highest regard for the maker of this motion and for his commitment for education, the education of our children. However, I part company with him on this testing issue.

Mr. Chairman, it seems like yesterday when we were all gathered, celebrating the proposal, was it called America 2000, that included this national testing. There was bipartisan support in the Congress of the United States, including some of the people who are speaking out against the testing this evening. The President of the United States, President Bush, gathered the Governors in a bipartisan fashion. They worked with the business community to develop a proposal that would meet the needs of our children, first and foremost, to prepare them for the work force, as well as to meet the needs of our country.

Mr. Chairman, that is why it seems so strange to me this evening to hear people who were so bullish, if I may borrow a word from the business community, on that proposal, which included testing, which the business community was emphatic about, national voluntary testing to be part of the proposal that was put forth.

President Clinton was at the time a Governor, and he was one of the co-chairs of the education task force. I think that the credentials of President Clinton in education are unsurpassed. It has been one of the priorities of his public life, the education of our children. He was committed to it in the statehouse, and he brought that value and that priority to the White House, and with it, a focus on what is best for our children.

That includes this national voluntary testing, and I repeat voluntary. The test that is being proposed by the administration will not impose a national curriculum. It will help States and local communities to tailor a curriculum to the needs of their students. It will provide parents and educators with information that will be helpful to assess the needs, as well as the progress, of their children. The voluntary national test, based on national assessment of educational progress, are tools to give parents and educators information on how students are performing academically.

Others have mentioned, and I will, too, voluntary testing for fourth-graders in reading and eighth-graders in math sets up a challenge, a standard of excellence. We need to invest in the education of our children through funding of programs like title I, but this is imperative, and national standards enhance that effort by allowing us to determine what tools are most effective in preparing our children most successfully for their futures. Setting challenges and higher standards leads to greater efforts to reach those standards.

I am proud to say that after a concentrated effort to meet the individual needs of students, and I repeat, a concentrated effort to meet the individual needs of students, test scores in my district, the district I represent in San Francisco, are up in reading and math for the fifth straight year.

It is my hope that over time, the voluntary testing program will be developed to include limited English-proficient students in testing our efforts to provide these students with equal access to quality education. That is a must.

Parents want to know that their children are learning. Educators want to know how to better reach students. Students need and want to live up to standards and challenges. Without an attempt at accountability in education, our children will not be as well prepared to compete in the 21st century.

I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island, who spoke from his experience as a professor and as a father, and I as a mother recall taking one of my five children to college when she was looking at colleges in her senior year in high school. And I remember the comment that she made when she was aspiring to one college or another about what was expected and what standards had to be

met to be admitted to certain colleges. She said, "I really wish I knew this when I was a freshman in high school, because I would have spent my time a little differently."

Well, she did well and she got in, but I do think that children should know what is expected of them, and I think that this balanced approach that the administration is taking of voluntary national testing helps students to know the challenges so they can meet the challenges.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE].

Mr. THUNE. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding time to me, Mr. Chairman, and commend him for his work as the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and for this amendment.

Some people think we do not have enough standardized national testing. They think we need to spend more than \$90 million on telling us how our kids are doing. Right now in my home State of South Dakota and other States around this country, we already give students two standardized tests at a cost of about \$30 million. Both of those tests are given in the month of March, and both take about a week to administer.

Now we are talking about yet another nationalized test, which would take about another week to administer and would be administered in the month of March. That means that people back home, students back home in my State of South Dakota, would spend virtually the entire month of March not learning, but testing. Think about it. Would you like to spend the better part of 3 weeks doing nothing but filling in the oval next to the correct answer with a number 2 pencil? I cannot think of anything I would dislike more, unless it is spending \$90 million to do it.

I have a novel idea. If we want to find out how our kids are doing and how they are doing in their local schools, we should call our child's teacher. I know it sounds crazy, but I believe the teachers and the parents back in South Dakota have a better idea of what is right for their children than do the bureaucrats in Washington, DC.

The keys to good education are good parents, good students, good teachers, and good schools. Another layer of bureaucracy is not going to improve American schools. If we really want to know how our students and our schools are doing, go to the people with the answers, our students and teachers. Our child's teacher knows more about how our child is doing than any staff in Washington is ever going to know.

I would also suggest in the area of the money that it is going to take to finance this test that we could probably ask parents in this country, and certainly in my State of South Dakota, if they could think of a better way to spend \$90 million. Do we think we have enough computers in the schoolrooms?

We could buy a lot of computers with \$90 million. How about our teachers? Is your child's teacher doing a good job? We could give your child's teacher a significant, substantial raise with \$90 million.

I do not believe national testing is in the best interests of our children, and certainly not the best use of our education tax dollars. That is why I am urging my colleagues to vote against Federal testing for America's schoolchildren and vote in favor of the Goodling amendment.

□ 2045

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Goodling amendment and in favor of finding out just how well this country is educating its future work force.

Today we are behind other nations in educational achievement. Forty percent of our children are not reading at the level they should be; 20 percent of our 8th graders are not even taking algebra. We know these statistics because we recently conducted studies comparing the achievement of our students with those in other countries.

This analysis is a valuable tool for educators, and the administration is trying to conduct a similar analysis to determine how local school districts compare nationally. It is the same kind of approach to find out what we need to be doing to better serve our students.

Despite what proponents of this amendment argue, no such mechanism for analysis currently exists to compare and find the information we need on a national basis. The National Assessment of Educational Progress, for example, is a sample test for a variety of subjects. The tests are not universally administered and are administered as a blind study telling us only national trends.

The new national test would be administered uniformly, it would provide a scale by which standards and progress can be measured, and it will help all of our local educational authorities assess the areas in their curriculum that need improvement.

Another critical difference in the new test is they would be available to parents and teachers who can chart their own children's progress and more easily assess their child's individual educational needs. If Johnny is the worst reading student in the 4th grade, it may help the teacher to know that he is actually way above the national standard. We need to know this kind of information.

Many of the discussions relating to education in this bill have focused on getting parents more involved in their child's education. These steps are a major part of that process. Experts in education, including the National Education Association, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National School Boards Association, they all support the proposal

to administer a voluntary national test. I am sure I will be corrected if I am wrong.

In addition, the proposal has overwhelming support from the business community, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the presidents and CEOs of hundreds of technology, manufacturing, service firms throughout the country.

The Goodling amendment would prohibit the use of educational improvement funding for the development of a national testing program in reading and mathematics. It is shortsighted because the ability to compare educational outcomes nationally is the critical first step necessary to improve our educational standards. This proposal is only in its infancy but its potential is enormous.

While I understand the committee chairman's interest in securing jurisdiction over this testing program, this is too important to be stopped because of that kind of territorial dispute. In fact, former Secretary Lamar Alexander used similar authority to develop voluntary national tests. We need to do so and we need to encourage the pursuit of excellence among our future work force.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, Mr. Chairman.

If I believed that the money for national testing would help the children of this country to do better in math and reading, I would support it in an instant. But, Mr. Chairman, we know where we are with respect to the academic achievement of our kids in America. Our States administer hundreds of tests and they know where the problems are. They know where the kids are who are poor at reading and math and they know where those are who excel. Further tests, in my judgment, do not add anything to what they already know. They are really unnecessary.

What we need to do is to take the money that might be spent on national testing and spend it to help those kids who need to be helped. That is where the money ought to be spent, not on tests that are not needed and are merely symbolic, as if that would solve our problem. We need to actually aim at the problem and get it solved.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his amendment. He has his priorities right.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCGOVERN].

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Goodling amendment. Today's students will be entering a highly competitive work force that will demand greater knowledge and skills. If we hope for our chil-

dren to compete in our increasingly global economy, we need to know that they match up to the highest possible academic standards, particularly with regard to reading and mathematics.

Voluntary national testing allows local school districts to focus on how best to improve these basic skills. They provide a measure of student performance against national standards in reading and math as well as against international standards of mathematics. These tests will empower parents by providing them with the information they need to determine if their kids are on track in the basic skills.

By 4th grade, students need to have mastered basic reading skills in order to begin to learn other subjects. Reading is an essential skill in learning science, history, mathematics, geography and social studies. Students who are not able to read independently by the end of 3rd grade have a very difficult time learning other subjects and will likely suffer academically. By 8th grade, students need to have mastered basic math skills if they want to take the advanced mathematics courses necessary for success either in college or in the work force.

Providing a voluntary reading test in 4th grade and a voluntary mathematics test in 8th grade will not create a national curriculum. Parents, teachers, schools and States will decide what their reading and math curriculum should be and how the subject should be taught.

Education is an issue that belongs in the hands of local school boards. Voluntary national tests give local school districts important information about how to use the results in shaping their own curriculum. The results of these voluntary national tests help teachers and principals to better understand where resources are most needed and how they can best be spent.

I am one Member of Congress who continues to fight for a far greater investment in education. In my own State of Massachusetts we have already instituted statewide testing in math, science and English. Furthermore, we are one of six States that have already volunteered to participate in President Clinton's national testing initiative. In the Commonwealth of Massachusetts we are proud to apply rigorous academic standards to our teachers, our schools and our students.

Instituting tough academic standards for our children should not be a partisan issue. Politics should stop at the schoolhouse door. Voluntary national tests improve the odds of success for all students, help energize local efforts to improve teaching and learning, and provide students, parents and teachers with accurate and reliable information about student performance.

Parents have a right to know how well their children are doing, and they have a right to insist that their children be given an education that will allow them to compete on a global scale as we move into the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Goodling amendment and stand up for higher academic standards in our schools.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BE-REUTER]. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, if I could have the attention of the ranking member. If the gentleman is finished yielding time, I would be willing to close debate at this particular time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee is entitled to close the debate.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] will close the debate. Does the gentleman have any more speakers?

Mr. OBEY. With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I think those defending the committee position have the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will advise that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]—as a member of the committee controlling time in opposition to the amendment—has the opportunity to close the debate.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that everyone understands that to have a valid test someone or some entity must determine what it is they want to test. Therefore, someone or some entity must determine the curriculum, and then the teacher must be trained to teach to that curriculum and to teach to that test.

I heard a lot of discussion about we are doing this on the State level, we are doing that on the State level. That was what Goals 2000 was all about, was spending \$50 million this year. We spent hundreds of millions in the past for Goals 2000. What was the purpose? The purpose was to give seed money to States and local entities to improve their education programs.

Forty-six States have already done that, and several have gotten up here opposing my amendment, at the same time saying all the wonderful things their States have done to elevate their curriculum, to elevate their standards.

Everybody wants high standards. As a matter of fact, when this debate began, the administration liked to say 80 percent of the people are for this. Well, what they did not say is what they asked the people is, "Do you believe in motherhood, apple pie and ice cream?" Well, I am surprised it was not more than 80 percent that believed in that. In other words, they were saying, "Do you want higher standards?" Of course.

But let me tell my colleagues what the poll tells us. Only 22 percent of the American people who were polled want the Federal Government to have any involvement whatsoever in determining those standards, in determining

curriculum. They say the Federal Government should not be involved. That is why only seven States, after all the pressure that was put on them, all the lobbying, only seven States said we will go along. Only 15 cities said we will go along.

So now we must have a national curriculum. Call it whatever we want, but if we are to test, then everyone has to be taught the same. As I said earlier, when the secretary said they do not have algebra until they get to 8th grade but we will test them for algebra, that does not make very much sense, does it?

So we take away all the creativity, all the creativity of that classroom teacher. This is what I hear from teachers in a State next to here. They say we have to teach to the test all day long. No creativity in our teaching. We must teach to all the tests that are out there.

I want to give my colleagues a good example. I was supervising student teachers in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. At the time there was the so-called Cuban missile crisis. I could not wait to get into all my student teachers' classrooms because I saw here they had a golden opportunity to teach math in relationship to the distance between Cuba and Pittsburgh, to teach history in relationship to that initiative that was going on at that time, a golden opportunity to get all of those children on the edge of their seat.

Not one student teacher mentioned the missile crisis in relationship to the headlines that they could hit Pittsburgh. And that evening I said, "I should fail all of you, you missed a golden opportunity to turn these people on." The response was, our master teachers told us we must stick strictly to the syllabus because that is what we have to cover. What a tragedy that was.

Now, people mentioned tests are for diagnostic purposes. Every time I told a teacher that their purpose for testing was to determine whether they presented the material well enough that everyone understood it or even if they presented it real well, there may be some who did not, who will need extra help. That was the purpose of that test.

To say somehow or other that the 50 percent who are not doing well in our schools are going to do better if we just have one more national test, there is no logic to that. No matter how we slice it, there is no logic. All of our children should have equal opportunity to do well. One more national test does not help them at all.

As I indicated before, reading readiness is very, very important. Parents being able to be the first and most important teacher that the child has is very, very important. And can my colleagues imagine that we would wait until 4th grade to determine that a child cannot read? What would we do? I would love to get my colleagues into a classroom and see us do remedial work with 5th grade students and 6th

grade students in reading. I want to see it done with 8th, 9th and 10th grade students in math. Why would we ever wait until that point to determine whether a child is doing well or doing poorly?

□ 2100

But I want to give credit. I want to give credit to the people out there who are working day and night to try to improve our education system. We are doing very well with 50 percent of our students because they are getting a lot in this debate. They have done very, very well.

Keep in mind we educate all. We educate all. Do not compare us with many, many other countries who have an elite system. We educate all. If we are going to give the 50 percent who are doing poorly an opportunity to do better, then we have to start much earlier than 4th grade, much earlier than 8th grade. It is over by that time, folks. It is over by that time for 90 percent of those people. They have dropped out, not physically, but they have dropped out by the time they got into 2nd or 3rd grade. They were not reading-ready, so we pushed them into 1st grade. And then many places they got social promotion, so we just compounded the problem.

Let us not make that mistake. Let us not have them fail. Let us have them ready. Let us have their parents ready to play a leading role. Over and over I heard people say, "Well, parents need to know." Parents have to know. Parents do not know now.

Again, I would love to have my colleagues in a classroom and I would love to have them get that 50 percent to attend parent conferences. Why do not many of them come? Because they have literacy problems and they do not have the confidence to come to a meeting of that nature.

So again, I would call on all of my colleagues to think in terms of children. Do not get the Federal Government involved in one more national test to tell 50 percent of our students one more time, make it 1,001 now, that they are doing poorly and to tell their parents one more time they are doing poorly.

All of these States, including California, including New York, are setting high standards; and they do not need us to dumb down what they are doing. And that is what I fear will happen if we get involved any more than we presently are involved.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, the committee officially on this side of the aisle will accept this amendment. But I will vote against it, for a number

of reasons. I would, essentially, like to simply direct my remarks to the most conservative Members of this House and the most liberal.

To conservatives I would simply say, I think it is necessary for us to recognize that not all Federal initiatives are bad. We have a national interest, indeed a national responsibility, to produce quality education in this country. We have a national responsibility to see to it that local school districts are measuring up to that responsibility and are indeed providing the quality opportunity for every American child which each and every American child under this Constitution has the right to expect.

I disagree fundamentally with the gentleman from Texas who said the Constitution does not even allow the Federal Government to prepare testing. The Constitution, the preamble, spells out the Federal Government's responsibility to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberties for ourselves and our posterity, among other things.

I think seeing to it that everyone has equal educational opportunity and that that opportunity is met with quality is indeed a Federal responsibility, even though the instruments by which we have chosen to meet that responsibility are largely local school districts.

It is naive to the extreme, in my view, to assume that, totally left to their own devices, local school districts will produce that equality of opportunity. That is why we have Federal law enforcement. That is why we have civil rights laws. That is why we have title I and a number of education programs aimed at assuring equal quality.

I would say to liberals, they do children no favors when they run away from either standards or testing. It seems to me that children desperately need to know where they stand. They desperately need to have us level with them in terms of how they are really doing. If we do not, then we get pressures for the very social promotion which a number of people in this House have voiced objection to.

I recognize that testing may demonstrate that students may have had an unequal opportunity to get a good education and that, therefore, they will do poorly on tests. I think that is one of the advantages of having those tests, because it will then demonstrate to this country the need to put additional resources into districts which, through no fault of their own, do not have the financial ability to provide the same kind of opportunity that some of our districts provide.

So I think on this issue it is necessary for both sides to put aside their ideology, to put aside their bias, to put aside their own philosophic preferences, and to instead put the needs of children first.

I think the President is trying to do that by his testing initiative. I would point out this bill does not allow testing to proceed until a lot of other

things happen and that they cannot proceed this year at all, and we have another appropriation bill next year that we can deal with if we do not like the kind of testing or the kind of tests which the administration has prepared, and under the Senate amendment, indeed, the preparation of those tests will be left in other hands.

So I will personally vote "no," even though I recognize that this amendment is going to pass by a very significant margin.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling Amendment regarding the issue of National Tests for Education. I commend the gentleman for his diligence on this matter; it is a testimony to his hard work that the amendment the House will now consider has been accepted by the House Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Subcommittee. I also commend my colleague from Illinois, Chairman PORTER, and Ranking Member OBEY for their excellent legislation. Debate on the Labor/HHS/Education bill has been long and in some cases contentious, and I commend their excellent leadership.

The Goodling Amendment prohibits the spending of any funds in this bill for the development, planning, implementation or administration of new national tests in 4th grade reading and 8th grade math.

As many of you know, earlier this year, President Clinton announced plans to develop and implement individual tests to compare student progress throughout the United States. Supporters of the Clinton testing proposal believe that the development of the tests, patterned after the widely acclaimed National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), is consistent with the Department of Education's traditional role in research and development and that Congressional input is unnecessary and not required by the general authority inherent in the Fund to Improve Education. Further, they assert that state participation in the testing program is strictly voluntary, and simply offers an unprecedented opportunity for individual students to compare their abilities with other students from across the nation.

Mr. Goodling's contention is that testing is not the answer to our education problems and that testing will not boost the academic achievement of American students. In addition, opponents of the Clinton testing proposal assert that there are already enough existing tests for evaluation and that the development of national tests is too controversial for the Administration to act without Congressional review or authorization.

My feelings on this matter are somewhat mixed. Most education experts would agree that the idea of national standards is an essential component of education reform. I believe that these standards should be based on core academic skills which are essential for the success of today's students. I voted for Goals 2000, and I continue my support for this legislation which encourages schools in their efforts to implement high academic standards. But, if we as a nation concede that academic standards are too low and that we must raise the academic bar for our students, then testing and evaluation of students' progress must necessarily follow the development of high standards. How else can parents, local school boards, school principals, and charter school founders compare the achievement of students?

However, confessing my support for some kind of national test, I still oppose the current effort by the Clinton Administration to develop said tests with no Congressional or outside education experts. Indeed, in the words of former Secretary of Education Bill Bennett, "if faced with a choice between no test and the Clinton test, I would endorse no test."

However, I am pleased that the House has an additional choice. I rise in support of the Goodling amendment, but also with the understanding that the Senate has acted on this proposal and that the Senate language offers a different and promising alternative. A proposal, offered by Senator DAN COATS (R-IN), adopted by the Senate, and endorsed by the Clinton Administration, seeks to make key changes to the Clinton plan which keep the idea of a national test, but add safeguards to ensure that the control and development of these tests is academic, and not political.

The Coats proposal will give the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB), a well-respected, independent, nonpartisan body, power to set policy for the national tests. Further the proposal will give NAGB authority to review and change all aspects of national test specifications, development contracts and advisory committees already implemented by the Administration. To further ensure NAGB non-partisanship, the proposal also makes key changes in the composition of the NAGB so that it has greater independence, adding another Governor, additional mayors, and representatives of business and industry.

I echo the sentiments of education reformers who state that they would prefer no test to a bad test, but most of all, prefer a good test. Indeed, let's pass the Goodling amendment, delaying the flawed Clinton Administration testing proposal, and support the efforts of those who seek to implement good tests for our nation's children.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Goodling Amendment to prohibit funding for President Clinton's national testing plan. This Congress has an obligation to ensure that any test administered on the national level will provide constructive information to help improve our educational system. However, President Clinton's national testing proposal was created without proper Congressional input. At the very least, the public deserves Congressional hearings on the matter.

I strongly support providing educators with the best tools to improve our classrooms and raise the level of student performance. Congressional hearings on national tests would allow parents, educators and the test designers to voice their concerns and offer their input, helping to design the most appropriate and effective test.

With the proper design, national tests would provide a much needed national standard for comparison. While some argue that these tests simply will divert much needed dollars from the classroom, national tests have the potential to help focus educational resources where they are needed most, eventually bringing all local schools to a higher level. If not constructed and implemented properly, however, these tests will not only waste taxpayer dollars, but could unfairly mischaracterize student and school performance. Clearly, a testing plan of this scale merits full Congressional attention.

We cannot deny that our schools are in need of reform. However, if national tests are

meant to enhance school performance, their design and implementation must be well founded. America's students deserve no less.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, we are today discussing how to give our children the tools they need to succeed in school. This administration, one of the most committed to improving opportunities for all students to learn, has gone a step too far in proposing the national testing initiative.

Don't misunderstand me. I agree with the administration's desire to raise standards for our children. We must have high standards. We must know what and if our children are learning in the classroom. Their success is our success.

We are discussing which tools will best serve schools, teachers and students. There is no question that we need to continue to find innovative approaches to meet the challenges of the late 20th century. Students who can't read can't learn to the fullest.

But national standardized testing is not necessarily the best tool to encourage learning and measure progress. In Texas, our kids are already tested every which way. It's not just students who think there are enough tests, but also teachers and parents.

Testing is necessary, of course, but too much testing, like too much of just about anything, can work against us. Teachers want their students to succeed. If success is measured only by test after test after test, then teachers will teach to the test rather than teach to learn. Students must learn how to think not just how to fill in the bubbles with a number 2 pencil.

Each child learns differently, and they all learn at a different pace. This is especially true for children with limited English backgrounds and for children with special needs.

These students need to be challenged to learn and grow. With the proper tools and attention, students with limited English skills will succeed. But they must be given a fair opportunity to do so.

Mandatory national tests won't help all kids. Testing should be optional; there should be alternatives; we should make sure that we don't have a one-size-fits-all national education program.

The best tools we have for teaching kids are the teachers themselves. We should direct our resources to them. Almost every teacher I have met, and during my time as a school board member I met many, wants to succeed and genuinely cares for the students. But they face terrible challenges: crumbling buildings, crime, drugs, lack of parental support, overcrowding, and a dearth of financial resources in our poorest neighborhoods.

I am afraid that national testing will ultimately stigmatize students who already face the greatest challenges. They need teachers empowered with proper resources, they need challenge, and they need a safe and secure place to learn. But they don't need another standardized test in the morning.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Representative GOODLING's amendment to bar funds for the national testing initiative as it currently exists. I hope that my vote, and that of other Members, especially those of the Congressional Black Caucus and Congressional Hispanic Caucus, sends a signal that such initiatives must become more inclusive and equitable.

I truly endorse the concept of standards in education. Our children have the right to obtain the core skills and knowledge they will

need to compete in a global marketplace. However, I cannot support President Clinton's voluntary national testing program in its present form.

I share the views of several prominent national civil rights groups including the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and the Leadership Council on Civil Rights. Congress ought to support a Federal initiative that creates higher academic standards, but in manner that is participatory and equitable. The Federal Government has a responsibility to watch out for the education of our students, especially those in poor communities. But national standards and assessment must be accompanied by funding to support curriculum development and teacher training so students of all backgrounds can do their best on the tests.

The reality is that students taking these tests do not start out on an equal ground. Because public schools rely significantly on local property taxes, some school districts are better funded than others. Any Federal standards and testing initiative must address these gaps. Unless Federal funds are earmarked for making sure that poorer children have an opportunity to learn, the federal testing program will discriminate against poor and minority children.

Additionally, parents, students, and teachers need assurance that the tests will not be misused. The Department maintains that the tests will be used for information purposes only. But the misuse of standardized tests is widespread. In my own district, I know of honor roll students who were not allowed to graduate 8th grade because they missed the passing test score by less than one point. Federal guidelines should urge school districts not to use the results of these tests as the sole factor in making high stakes decisions about a student's educational progress such as tracking, ability grouping, and retention.

Finally, there is the issue of making sure that national tests are developed with respect to the growing diversity of our Nation's 35 million school children. The growing multiculturalism of our communities, and hence, our public schools, demand that we respect diversity and different learning styles. National Assessment should identify the knowledge and skills students already possess rather than their deficiencies. We should always strive to build on students' strengths, not their weaknesses. As Federal funding for low-income disabled children shrinks, especially due to Federal welfare reform, national testing must accommodate the special needs of these students.

I also support the position of my colleagues in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus who point out that high standards should be established for all children. In its present form, the national test is designed to exclude limited English proficient [LEP] students from the reading test. This policy discriminates and cannot be tolerated. The national tests are supposed to tell us how our school districts are doing. But how do we hold them accountable to LEP students and their families if these very students are excluded from taking these tests? I cannot support the administration developing tests that exclude a growing segment of the student population.

The education of our children is among our Nation's top priorities. Despite my vote today, I will continue to work with my constituents, including parents and schools in the first con-

gressional district, and the administration to do whatever is necessary to fulfill our children's right to a first-class education based on respect.

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment.

I am not against educational testing as a tool to assess our children's level of achievement and in order to address uncovered deficiencies.

But, Mr. Chairman, additional testing is not needed to tell us what we already know—that children in our public schools, especially in minority communities are underachieving.

This is true in my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, for the same reasons as our counterparts on the mainland.

First, we send our children to schools that are dilapidated, unsafe, and in need of repair. We tell them every day when they look at the schools they attend, that we don't care—that they, our children, are not important—that we are not willing to invest in their future.

And we don't invest in providing the tools that all of our children must have if they are to be prepared to take their rightful place in society.

I am not against testing, per se, but I am against it until the playing field has been leveled for our children: until they are provided with a good and nurturing educational environment; until they are provided with well paid teachers, basic books, and supplies and the all important technology.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I will support testing, but not before.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I'm a strong supporter of the amendment offered by my chairman, Mr. GOODLING, to prohibit the expenditure of public funds to develop national tests, until Congress has explicitly given the go ahead.

Congress has the responsibility for setting major policies for this Government. And, certainly, creating national education tests for our children is an issue Congress must decide. We can't leave the development of national tests that could mark our children for generations, to some bureaucrat at the White House or at the Department of Education.

National tests are controversial and deserve to have the sunlight of debate. National tests are more than just having an excuse to have a Rose Garden ceremony at the White House.

Congress will be taking action on this question within the next year or so. Surely, the deliberative process, and the will of the people, should be heard before the President launches us down the testy road of national testing.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Goodling amendment. No matter what side of the issue you are on; whether you favor or oppose national testing—the right of the peoples' House to set national education policy, must be respected by the administration.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment.

The administration is attempting to avoid the current education policy by implementing an agenda that focuses on national testing. These tests only undermine the State and local curriculum. This proposal serves as an unfair comparison between schools and students.

In addition, the Department's of Education's budget did not include any type of national testing and further, the Department has not

submitted a proposal to Congress requesting authorization for this type of testing.

It is critical that we concentrate on the real problems such as teacher training, improved academic performance, and increased parental involvement in our classrooms. Local solutions enhance a child's education, not another Federal standardize test.

My constituents back in Riverside County, CA, are tired of the Federal Government meddling with their children's education.

I encourage my colleagues to vote to stop the intrusion of Government and support the Goodling amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment, but I certainly would like the opportunity to state my concerns as a parent and longtime educator regarding national testing.

First and foremost, our children are already over tested. Children in nearly every school system in this country are subjected to a battery of standardized tests for a variety of reasons; some are diagnostic, some are meant to gather information to measure individual progress, and some are used to make institutional comparisons. Frequently, these tests are designed for one purpose and used for another purpose. This doesn't lead to better data or more comprehensive conclusions, but testing abuse which is a form of child abuse.

Tests should be used primarily to measure what is learned and what isn't learned. Tests could also be used to measure what is taught and what isn't taught. And the tests should be tied as closely to classroom realities as possible. The further we get away from the classroom and the dynamics of the classrooms, the more convoluted the lesson of testing becomes and the potential for abuse of testing results increases.

Here in Washington, far removed from the classroom we are quick to use tests to make generalizations about the characteristics of student populations, the underlying ability of individual students and to make wholesale generalizations about the quality of school systems. We crave the statistics to help make our point regardless of whether the case of learning is advanced. Regrettably, we help create the opportunity for more testing abuse.

We do need testing, but we need to understand that testing is a tool to achieve the basic purpose of assessing what is taught and what is learned. We need to identify the criteria of what we hope to achieve before we leap into the bottomless pit of standardized test after standardized test.

We do need standards and we need a discussion of national standards. It occurs to me that we struggle with a kind of national schizophrenia about the state of our schools in this country. On the one hand we decry our standing in the world when compared to Japan, Korea, and many countries in Europe, whose school systems are national in scope and implementation. But we shrink from discussing standards under the fear of undermining local authority. We live in a global economy and we live in an educationally competitive world and we should not shrink from discussion about standards which will guide our children to be productive, competitive citizens in the next millennium.

But we shouldn't confuse testing with standards, not until we understand what kinds of standards we wish to implement. Testing should reflect standards and not define them.

In this debate, as well as far too many other debates regarding education, we have allowed the tail to wag the dog, the tool to govern the handyman, the test to run the classroom.

We need to understand that a national test at this time will not move us toward such standards nor will they help us make meaningful comparisons to other nations. National testing at this time will not contribute to clarifying which communication or computational skills are necessary as basic standards or are necessary to survive in the world.

Instead, these tests would be used to make internal comparisons, between States, between districts, between groups of students. Testing without informed use to make judgments about how much progress we are making towards clearly identified criteria will be used to make claims about progress in others.

Instead of moving us toward standards, these test would be additional tools for some politicians to make charges about schools, to stigmatize entire blocks of students, and to criticize entire school districts. Therefore, our responsibility should be to make every effort to adequately fund education, to articulate standards which may lead to informed testing and to protect our children in this process from testing abuse.

Some of this abuse includes using the tests for making detrimental educational policies that will do irreversible damage to our children. For example, administrator of schools with low test scores are pressured to weed out below average scoring students rather than providing much needed resources to improve student performance. This "Gaming of Tests" provides incentives for school systems to purge low-test scorers from public schools and herd them into alternative schools.

This type of stigma has already had its damaging effects on the faith, hopes, and aspirations of many of our children. We see it here in Washington, we see it in many urban areas, and we see it in many of the schools in our own districts.

As an educator, as a parent, as your colleague, let's bring some reasoned discussions to this most important topic. This is beyond politics, beyond credit for national initiatives, beyond this side of this aisle and that side of the aisle. This is about the aisles in classrooms, this is about moving each student from basic skill to basic skill, from this century into the next and from rural and urban classrooms throughout America into a complex and competitive new world.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Mr. GOODLING's amendment. In so doing, I want to thank Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON for helping me remember an important lesson learned.

We have a crisis in the schools of the District of Columbia—like we do in my home district in Philadelphia. Here in Washington, school opening day was postponed by 3 weeks and Congresswoman NORTON challenged us to take in a student as an intern. In the absence of school, the hope is that we would be able to provide students with another avenue of learning.

My office has been lucky enough to host Heyda Benkriera, a junior at the Woodrow Wilson Senior High in Tenleytown. Heyda is a joy—smart, hard-working, mature, and a great sport. Some people who have worked with Heyda are shocked to learn that she's in high school, that she's not a member of our staff.

Heyda and Congresswoman NORTON reminded us of a truism that we already knew but took for granted—that Heyda, and her fellow students, are our future. I am here today to remind this Congress what Heyda has taught us—that we as a nation must meet the challenge of bringing back our schools here in the District of Columbia, in Philadelphia, and across the Nation.

I am convinced that one way we can do this is to embrace the kind of national testing program our President has proposed. This is a way for us to better insure that kids in Philadelphia, PA, Washington, DC, and Selma AL, are getting a fair and equal chance at a great future. The best education is a local concern but also a national challenge.

Bright minds and bright futures depend on our commitment to education in big cities and rural schools.

Thank you for your time, Heyda, and thank you for the lesson you taught us. For Heyda and all the other Heydas, I urge my colleagues to support the President's testing program.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, as a father, grandfather, and former member of the Carlsbad, CA, School Board, I take a personal interest in providing quality education for our children. Parents and local school boards know best what their children's education needs are—not bureaucrats in Washington. For these reasons, I rise today to express my grave concerns about President Clinton's proposal for national school testing.

This is a waste of taxpayer's money and will do little more than increase Federal involvement in our schools. In my view, national school testing is an unnecessary Federal intrusion. I am pleased that our colleague, BILL GOODLING, has chosen to offer an amendment to prohibit any funds from being used to develop and implement a national test. We need to restore more local control of education. I intend to wholeheartedly support the Goodling amendment in order to ensure for the prosperity of our schools and the education of our children.

Mr. Chairman, the Government already spends more than \$500 million a year to help States develop their own achievement tests. The Clinton plan would cost another \$22 million. This is money that could be better spent in the classrooms.

Let's put education policy back in the hands of parents and teachers, rather than the Department of Education. Instead of developing new national tests, I believe we should send scarce Federal dollars directly to the classroom, bolster basic academics, and increase parental involvement. These should be our top priorities—not more testing. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote for the Goodling amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thurs-

day, July 31 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA
Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. HOEKSTRA:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 516. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the expenses of an election officer appointed by a court to oversee an election of any officer or trustee for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the Federal funding for the Teamsters election, or perhaps the Federal funding for rerunning of the teamsters election. Let me share with my colleagues some of the facts about the election that was just recently completed.

Nearly \$20 million of Federal taxpayers' dollars was spent on the Teamsters election that was completed in December of 1996. This 1996 Teamsters election was recently invalidated by the Clinton administration due to charges of illegal campaign contributions and other improprieties.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, with jurisdiction over all Federal education and work force policy issues, I believe it is the responsibility of this committee to provide accountability to the taxpayers for their dollars, to ensure honesty and integrity in this election process, and to facilitate learning from the mistakes that we may make so as not to repeat them in the future.

My subcommittee is going to be involved in these kinds of efforts. We are going to find out where were these dollars spent in the elections that were just completed in 1996. We are going to audit those dollars and share the results with Congress. We want to find out and discover why this process has to be so complex.

When we take a look at \$20 million of taxpayers' money for this election, that cost almost \$45 for every vote that was cast. What did we get for those dollars? What is the election officer's role? It appears to be almost virtually unrestricted. How long did this process go on? Even after this election is completed, there is a whole series of appeals that are now available. And now most troubling, what happened in this election is that the election officer points out the types of illegal campaign contributions that were made and some of the improprieties.

Let me give my colleagues some examples. Martin Davis, a top campaign

consultant to the Carey campaign, the November Group, he was indicted in New York on charges of illegally diverting at least \$95,000 of International Brotherhood of Teamsters money into the campaign. Michael Ansara of the Share Group pled guilty in New York on charges of conspiracy to illegally divert at least \$95,000 of IBT money into the Carey campaign. Or Rochelle Davis, she is deputy director for Citizen Action and its affiliate, Campaign for a Responsible Congress, seeks immunity for her cooperation with regard to \$75,000 to \$475,000 in funds channeled to Carey's campaign. Jere Nash, the Carey campaign manager, took the fifth amendment in testimony before a Federal appeals court on the information that he provided to the election officer. Carey's campaign has returned over \$220,000 in questionable campaign donations.

No one knows the full story yet. But we do know that the Federal Government running this campaign or supervising this election could not guarantee us a fair election. What we now need to do is to step back and take a time-out to learn from the mistakes that were made and to make sure that we do not spend more taxpayers' dollars in a process that does not give us the kind of results that we would like to have.

So what does my amendment do? My amendment strictly prohibits the use of taxpayer funds for a rerun of the Teamsters elections. The Government can still supervise the election. That is our role and responsibility, to make sure that Federal laws are followed. But we should not be paying for or administering the printing of ballots, the counting of ballots, and these administrative types of activities. This is an internal function to the International Brotherhood of Teamsters that should be paid for by the Teamsters, not by the taxpayers.

As I talked with my constituents about this issue, they are amazed that the taxpayers would be paying for that kind of internal operations; and they want it known that they do not approve and do not want to pick up the tab for another election or rerun elections. There is no debate that the Teamsters deserve an honest and a fair election. We will work with them through that process, but the taxpayers should not pay for it.

In addition, there is no proof that Federal funds provide assurance of a fair election. In fact, the 1991 election was paid for by the Teamsters, was certified, and Ron Carey was elected as president. What this shows is that Federal taxpayer dollars do not make or break an election.

It is time to step back to evaluate and make sure that we do not make the same mistakes over. There were lots of mistakes that were made in this last election. They were made at the cost of \$20 million to the American taxpayer. It should not happen again. We do not have a responsibility to do that.

CRS has issued an opinion that stated that there would be no consequences should the Congress not pay for the 1996 election.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOEKSTRA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It went on to say that the decree embodies the consent of the Union defendants to governmental supervision, not the consent of Congress. The consent decree states that the Federal Government has the option of running the Teamsters election and references Government financing with a 1996 opinion.

□ 2115

It is silent on the issue of funding beyond 1996. Therefore, it is the prerogative of Congress to speak at this time. We need to make sure that we have accountability for taxpayer dollars, ensure honesty and integrity in the election process and facilitate learning. Now is the time to step up and protect the taxpayer dollars and to ensure and put together a process to give the Teamsters a fair election.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Michigan has an excellent amendment. I would say that it is consistent with what is already in the bill. There is no money in this bill for the Federal Government to pay for another Presidential election for the Teamsters. This amendment merely makes that explicit. I certainly accept the amendment.

We provided through the Department of Labor, \$5.6 million in fiscal 1996 and an additional \$3.8 million in fiscal 1997, a total of about \$9.5 million for the 1996 Teamster election. This amount was more than matched by the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary, which provided the balance of \$21 million to conduct the 1996 election.

As the gentleman mentioned, under the consent decree of 1989 entered when President Bush was our President, the Federal Government agreed to pay for the 1996 Teamster election, and the Teamsters themselves agreed to pay for the 1991 election. What was the national interest in doing that? It was to take a union that was obviously and by everyone's evaluation under the control of unsavory elements and attempt to assure democratic elections. The goal was to reform the union and remove that unsavory control that had been a part of their history for a long, long time.

I think the taxpayers have gone as far as they should go in paying for Teamster elections. I do not think we should ask the taxpayers to pay again for the irregularities that have occurred in the last election, and I believe that any further responsibility for reform is up to the Teamsters

Union and new elections paid for by them. I think the gentleman has offered a very good amendment. We accept it and believe that it makes explicit what is already implicit in the bill; namely, that this is no longer a Federal responsibility in any way, shape or form.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the Hoekstra amendment, but, frankly, I believe the \$20 million that was spent on the Teamsters election in 1996 should be paid back. Talk about general welfare. They represent one-half of 1 percent of the population, yet the taxpayers of this country had to foot the bill for almost \$20 million to pay for their election. That makes no sense. So in this amendment we simply say since that election in 1996 was fraudulent, certainly the taxpayers will not have to pay again.

The gentleman pointed out that there is no money authorized or appropriated for a rerun of their election, but I would point out there was no money appropriated in 1996 for the election either. It was a transfer of funds in the Justice Department.

Those who do say that the 1989 consent decree, which is right here, said that the taxpayers should pay for the 1996 election have not read the consent decree real well. It said clearly that the taxpayer will pay to supervise an election, not pay to run the entire election, printing ballots, et cetera. We need to make sure at least on this amendment that we do not fall into the trap again of having the American taxpayer foot a \$20 million bill.

On August 22, 1997, the election officer issued a 134-page decision that she would not certify the election and requested a rerun of the election as the result of finding illegal campaign contributions to the Carey campaign as well as a very complex scheme of money laundering to fund the Carey campaign with funds from the Teamsters' treasury. This money laundering scheme involved Citizen Action and the National Council of Senior Citizens, front groups for the unions, and it involved a complex scheme to put money into congressional campaigns. In the last election, labor unions tried to buy this Congress with their illegal activities, distortions, and misrepresentations of the facts with their whatever it takes plan. This laundering scheme was part of all of that.

Every one of you in this Congress who have been attacked by the unions unfairly and untruthfully should vote for this amendment. Every one of you in this Congress who do not want the taxpayers to pay another \$20 million to benefit one-half of 1 percent of the taxpayers should vote for this amendment. Every one of you that represent the 49 percent of the Teamsters that voted for Jimmy Hoffa, Jr., for president of the Teamsters should vote for this amendment. Every one of you that say we

should fund special education to its legal amount of 40 percent should vote for this amendment. Every one of you who want more inspectors at OSHA should vote for this amendment.

This is what is meant by prioritizing your spending. We cannot afford to waste another \$20 million of the taxpayers' money to have an election for one-half of 1 percent of the people. Vote for the Hoekstra amendment, and do not cheat the taxpayers out of another \$20 million.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois indicated that he accepted the amendment for the committee. We also accept it on this side of the aisle. I would simply note that I have some doubts about it, because the original funding provided by the Congress to supervise these elections came as the result of an agreement entered into by the Justice Department under the Bush administration.

I think it is in the national interest of the United States to see to it that fair elections are conducted in this union. It has a long and checkered history. I think it is in the interest of the country to see to it that the union is as clean as possible.

It is obvious at this point that there are considerable problems with the last election. We do not know yet what the court decision is going to be, but as the gentleman has indicated, there is no money in this bill for financing supervision of any pending election, so there is certainly no problem at this point with accepting the amendment.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hoekstra amendment. The 1996 Teamsters election of its officers, including the election of its President Ron Carey, has been nullified as has been indicated because of fraud, and under the order of a Federal court-appointed election officer, one Barbara Zack Quindel, who had the duty to supervise the election.

Previously, in 1988, the United States Government had initiated litigation against the Teamsters to rid the union of the influence of organized crime. That led to the entry of a consent decree, which has been referred to, by a New York Federal court providing for the election officer to supervise the 1996 Teamster election to make sure the election was fair and open. As we all know, the election was not very fair. Even though the 1996 Teamster election was supervised by the court-appointed election officer, still, as the election officer herself recently ruled, the 1996 election of Teamster officers was a nullity because of the fraudulent siphoning of union funds to various third parties, who in turn laundered such funds and then contributed them back into the campaign fund of Ron Carey, the president of the Teamsters. Mr. Carey won a very narrow victory in that election for a second term as

president of the Teamsters over challenger James Hoffa, using, however, the tainted contributions. And apparently, as has been indicated, the cost of conducting and operating this fraudulent 1996 Teamster election was financed by the American taxpayers at an estimated cost of \$20 million.

It now appears that a rerun of the court-monitored but fraudulent 1996 election will be required. I think most people do believe that this time around, the cost of conducting and/or supervising a rerun election under court order should be paid for by the Teamsters Union and not by the American taxpayers. Thus this amendment attempts to make it clear that at least none of the funds made available in this appropriation bill may be used to pay the expenses of the election officer appointed to oversee the rerun of the Teamster election, whoever that may be.

By the way, I might add that the election officer has seen fit to resign from her post.

At this point, no one knows just how much the conducting and supervising of the Teamsters' 1996 election did or will cost the American taxpayer, nor do we know what the cost will be for a rerun of the election. I do think that this time around, though, as we find ourselves in a position where the United States Government has to now monitor a rerun of a previously monitored but corrupt 1996 election, that certainly this time the union is the entity who ought to pay those costs and not the taxpayer. The amendment may not do the whole job, but it certainly is pointed in the right direction.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let us focus on what happened here. A judge in New York allowed a consent decree as part of a settlement of a corruption charge against the Teamsters Union. That 1989 consent decree said that the Teamsters would pay for the 1991 election; the American taxpayer would pay for the 1996 election.

Mr. Chairman, rightly or wrongly, the families of this country did pay tens of millions of dollars out of their pockets for an election in 1996. Is it their fault the Teamsters and the Federal Government could not conduct an honest election? No. It is not the fault of the American taxpayer, and it is not their responsibility to clean up the mess. They have lived up to their end of the bargain, and it is time for Congress to stand up and prevent the taxpayer from being fleeced by forcing them to pay for a rerun election. The taxpayers funded an election for a private union. The election was filled with unethical behavior. That is it. The Teamsters had their bite of the apple, and this amendment would guarantee that taxpayer funds would not be wasted again.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gen-

tleman from Michigan. The issue here is whether taxpayers should pay twice for the same Teamsters' election. Hardworking, law-abiding American workers have already forked over more than \$20 million for a corrupt, fraudulent 1996 election. Some estimate that when we are done sorting out this whole mess that taxpayers will have paid \$30 million or more. It was not the taxpayers' fault that this election stunk to high heaven. It was not the taxpayers' fault that "funny money" was illegally floated around Ron Carey's campaign. This Nation's taxpayers should not be on the hook for the re-run election which has been ordered by the election overseer.

It has been said that this amendment would mean the Congress is meddling with the courts. Yes, a settlement of corruption charges against the Teamsters did result in a 1989 consent decree saying that the Teamsters would pay for the 1991 election and that the taxpayers would pay for the 1996 election. But the consent decree did not say that the taxpayers would pay for a re-run election in 1997 that is ordered because of corruption.

American families have already paid for one election that they did not get, and they should not have to pay for another. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. BEREUTER]. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 5 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING]; amendment No. 41 offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

