

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

labeled as a difficult student or whatever.

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

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Rebuilding computers.

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

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

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

□ 2115

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

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

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

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

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

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

trolling dollars and direction for our local schools.

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

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

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

AMERICA IS FACING A CRITICAL DECISION ON EDUCATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

fourth graders or one national test, and that is Federal Government test, in mathematics for eight graders, we will have ceded the control of our children's education over to faceless, nameless Washington bureaucrats deep in the bowels of the education establishment, deep in the bowels of the Department of Education, or in some consulting firm.

Mr. Speaker, I think we owe our children better than that. We cannot give away local control of our schools to Federal bureaucrats. Why would a national test do that? Members say, how can a national test be that dangerous? How can it be that threatening? The answer is a simple one: What is tested is what will be taught. We all understand that.

My daughter, Courtney, back in Phoenix, AZ, and my son, Stephen, are doing well in school, but they are doing well because their teachers, and I have faith in teachers, they are good people, their teachers learn what Courtney and Stephen are going to be tested on, and they make sure that in the curriculum they teach them what they will be tested upon.

So what is tested is what will be taught, and if we allow the test to be written in Washington, D.C., then what will be taught across America will be what some Federal bureaucrat deep in the bowels of the education department decides ought to be taught, because they will write the test, and your children's teacher and my children's teachers will be forced to teach to that test. We must block that effort to nationalize education. That fight is now, here in Washington, today. The decision will be made in Washington next week. There will be a vote in the U.S. Senate and a vote in the U.S. House.

Americans who do not want to give up control over their children's education to a bunch of nameless, faceless Washington bureaucrats need to speak out now. They need to call Washington, call their Congressman, call their Senator, and say, do not let national testing steal control away from our teachers in our neighborhood, from our school board in our neighborhood.

Some of the proponents of this idea say, do not worry, it is only voluntary. That is a hollow defense of a bad idea, because in America today there are only about 4 or 5 textbook writers. If we write one national test in Washington, D.C. and say, this will be given to all kids, sure, you will be able to opt out of the test, but the textbook writers, the people who write the curriculum for the schools, will write to that test. They will have no choice. If you sit on a school board or if you sit in your parent-teacher council and do not like that test, do not like that curriculum, you will have no choice.

We have to reject this idea and reject it now, and reject it decisively by a vote in the U.S. Senate as early as next week. I urge Americans who care about their children's education to speak out, and not let Washington seize control of

their school's education program. The price is simply too high.

There are radicals in Washington, D.C. who are writing a radical test; a test that, for example, in math does not even test basic math skills. But make no mistake about it, it does not matter whether the radicals write the test or good people write the test. If the test is a top-down, Washington-knows-best, one-size-fits-all idea, it will hurt education, because it will cost those parents and teachers in your school control of education in their neighborhoods. I hope Americans are listening.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RYUN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today after 4 p.m. and tomorrow, on account of attending his daughter's wedding.

Mr. HOUGHTON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CLAY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FATTAH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCOTT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FORD, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. SANCHEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes on October 28.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BILBRAY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS.
Ms. HARMAN.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. KIND.
Mr. CUMMINGS.
Ms. STABENOW.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. BARCIA.
Mr. ANDREWS.
Ms. SANCHEZ.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN.
Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. DICKS.
Mr. SHERMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. PAPPAS.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mrs. MORELLA.
Mr. WALSH.
Mr. BALLENGER.
Mr. CALVERT.
Mr. PAUL.
Mr. EHLERS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOEKSTRA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUYER.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Ms. KAPTUR.
Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado.
Mr. SPRATT.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. CRANE.
Mr. GINGRICH.
Ms. KILPATRICK.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony honoring Leslie Townes (Bob) Hope by conferring upon him the status of an honorary veteran of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on House Oversight.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 97. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that