

(b) ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.—The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the event, including arrangements to limit access to a portion of Constitution Avenue as required for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193d; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event authorized by section 1.

SEC. 5. LIMITATIONS ON REPRESENTATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person may represent, either directly or indirectly, that this resolution or any activity carried out under this resolution in any way constitutes approval or endorsement by the Federal Government of any person or any product or service.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board shall enter into an agreement with the sponsor, and such other persons participating in the event authorized by section 1 as the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board considers appropriate, under which such persons shall agree to comply with the requirements of subsection (a). The agreement shall specifically prohibit the use of any photograph taken at the event for a commercial purpose and shall provide for the imposition of financial penalties if any violations of the agreement occur.

Mr. KIM (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KIM).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for a clinic to be conducted by the United States Luge Association."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 305.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1998

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Thursday, July 30, 1998.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON FRIDAY, JULY 31, 1998

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, July 30, 1998, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Friday, July 31, 1998.

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

There was no objection.

PASS MAMMOGRAPHY QUALITY STANDARDS ACT

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, great strides have been made in concurring breast cancer. Much of this progress is due to the work of the Congress in general and the bipartisan Congressional Women's Caucus in particular. Tamoxifen, a new drug now promises to prevent and cure breast cancer.

One of the seven must-pass bills of the bipartisan Congressional Women's Caucus this year is the reauthorization of the Mammography Quality Standards Act to assure correct and safe mammograms. This bill has passed unanimously in the Senate. We cannot go home without doing the same here. American women and families deserve no less.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the record the testimony from the Women's Caucus hearing on tamoxifen.

INTRODUCTION OF PANELISTS

Witness 1: Surgeon General David Satcher.

Witness 2: Rici Rutkoss—Tamoxifen study participant.

Witness 3: Lynda Peterson—Chair-Elect of the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation/At high risk for breast cancer and considering Tamoxifen.

Witness 4: Marica Plater—At high risk for breast cancer and considering Tamoxifen.

Witness 5: Leslie Ford, NCI Associate Director of Oncology.

Witness 6: Dr. Michael Friedman, FDA—Acting Commissioner.

Witness 7: Dr. Gerard Kennealey, Zeneca—Vice President of Medical Affairs.

NEW STUDY ON EDUCATION IN AMERICA SHOWS NO IMPROVE- MENT FOR OUR CHILDREN

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about education here in the United States.

For the past year, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the

Committee on Education and the Workforce, has been conducting hearings all across the United States. They have been to 22 different cities. They have been to large cities, they have been to small towns, and they have been to rural communities. They visited 26 different educational institutions. They have had 200 expert witnesses, and they have talked about what is happening in education today.

They are going to be coming out very soon with a report, and I invite all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get a copy of this report, because they have spent an awful lot of time and a certain amount of taxpayers' dollars to find out what is really happening in education in America today.

Their findings are somewhat troubling. They find, for example, that there has been no real improvement in education in America since the report entitled "A Nation At Risk." They found that Washington programs have done nothing to improve children's education; and, finally, they have determined that this is not acceptable to the Congress and certainly is not acceptable to the American people.

So what do we have to do? An important thing about this report also is it has recommendations. We must focus on children by strengthening the role of parents. Now, that should not surprise many parents. We must restore local control by getting Washington out of the way. We must get dollars into the classroom instead of losing them to the bureaucracy; and, finally, and most importantly, we must emphasize basic academics rather than social experimentation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will get a copy of this report, and I hope they will all read it. I include for the RECORD a copy of same.

THE "EDUCATION AT A CROSSROADS" REPORT

Methods

22 Congressional hearings across America and in Washington, D.C.;

26 educational institutions visited;

200 expert witnesses.

Major findings

There has been no improvement in American education since A Nation at Risk.

Washington programs have done nothing to improve children's education.

This is not acceptable.

Recommendations

We must focus on children by strengthening the role of parents.

We must restore local control by getting Washington out of the way.

We must get dollars into classrooms instead of losing them in bureaucracy.

We must emphasize basic academics rather than social experimentation.

EDUCATION AT A CROSSROADS: WHAT WORKS AND WHAT'S WASTED IN EDUCATION TODAY

INTRODUCTION

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, in accordance with Rule X of the U.S. House of Representatives,¹ undertook an intensive review of the federal role in education. This review, which included extensive visits to schools across the country, is

¹Footnotes at end of article.

the only known such review ever performed by the Committee or by Congress.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

America's educational system is at a crossroads. Down one path can be found the many successful schools and systems that have emerged from the crisis of the 1980s to become shining examples of educational excellence. Down the other path are schools that are mired in failure or that have implemented erroneous reforms, succeeding only in worsening their already dismal performances. At the intersection of these two paths are the vast majority of America's schools—stagnating in mediocrity—at the crossroads of excellence and failure.

The purpose of the Committee on Education and the Workforce's Crossroads project was to identify the steps that lead in the direction of either excellence or failure in order to develop a positive vision for change. At a time when the economy continues to grow and technological advancements of the information age are fundamentally changing how we live and work, our nation should not be willing to accept mediocrity in education. America needs to develop a world class education system that is second to none. In order to succeed, our education system must have flexibility and vision—a willingness to think and act "outside of the box"—for the sake of our children.

Since the seminal report *A Nation at Risk* was released in 1983 describing the "rising tide of mediocrity" in America's schools, there have been some improvements. More students than ever are going on to college. SAT scores have risen moderately and fourth grade students have performed well on international comparison tests. However, despite these few bright spots, current indicators paint a disappointing picture overall of the preparedness of today's students to continue our nation's economic strength well into the 21st century.

40 percent of fourth-graders do not read at even a basic level.²

Half of the students from urban school districts fail to graduate on time, if at all;³

Average 1996 NAEP scores among 17-year-olds are lower than they were in 1984, a year after *A Nation at Risk* was released;

U.S. 12th graders only outperformed two out of 21 nations in mathematics;⁴

American students fall farther behind students from other countries the longer they are in school;⁵

Public institutions of higher education annually spend \$1 billion on remedial education.⁶

The factors behind stagnant scores and declining international performance must be addressed to ensure that U.S. students are competitive in a global marketplace when they graduate.

For more than 40 years, the federal government has been increasingly influential in local schooling. Since 1957, when the Soviet Union launched the Sputnik satellite, federal education spending and red tape has been expanding and becoming more involved in the classroom. Since 1980, nearly \$400 billion has been spent by the federal government on education.

A Key decision at the crossroads: It is time for America to take a careful look at what billions of federal education dollars have purchased, and to make hard decisions about whether to continue expanding the federal role, or to return control to parents and teachers.

The Crossroads project began in 1995 as a project of the House Education and Workforce Committee's Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, under the leadership of Chairman Pete Hoekstra. Its mission was to answer the following questions about education:

1. What are the elements of a successful school?

2. To what extent do federal education programs contribute or detract from those factors?

3. What works and what is wasted?

After asking the General Accounting Office (GAO) to determine the elements of successful schools, the Subcommittee began a series of hearings around the country to look at what works and what is wasted at the local level.⁷ The Subcommittee traveled to 15 states and heard from more than 225 witnesses. These hearings gave principals, teachers, parents, students and state officials from around the country a rare opportunity to share their experiences about what works and what is wasted. Rather than relying on a small, elite group of witnesses who could leave their work to come to Washington and testify, the Subcommittee visited educators, parents and students where learning takes place: the classroom. From small towns to major cities, real people discussed real successes and problems in education. Apart from these hearings, these voices may never have been heard.

Based on the findings of GAO and these hearings, the Subcommittee found that successful schools and school systems were not the product of federal funding and programs; but instead were characterized by: Parents involved in the education of their children; local control; emphasis on basic academics; and dollars spent on the classroom, not bureaucracy and ineffective programs.

The current Federal role

In addition to these findings, the Crossroads project research the nature of the current federal role in education. The Committee found a system fraught with failure and bureaucracy:

More than 760 federal education programs: For the first time in the history of federal education funding, the Committee assembled the most comprehensive list of federal education programs to date. At least 39 federal agencies oversee more than 760 education programs, at a cost of \$100 billion a year to taxpayers. The Congressional Research Service has confirmed that these numbers are accurate, and even added additional programs to the 760 originally found by the committee.

The leviathan of federal education programs has actually led to a cottage industry in selling information on program descriptions, application deadlines and filing instructions for each of the myriad of federal education programs. The Education Funding Research Council identifies potential sources of funds for local school districts, and sells for nearly \$400 the Guide to Federal Funding for Education. The company promises to steer its subscribers to "a wide range of Federal programs," and offers these subscribers timely updates on "500 education programs." More recently, the Aid for Education Report published by CD Publications advertised that "huge sums are available . . . in the federal government alone, there are nearly 800 different education programs that receive authorization totaling almost a hundred billion dollars."

Mountains of Paperwork: Even after accounting for recent reductions, the U.S. Department of Education still requires over 48.6 million hours worth of paperwork per year—or the equivalent of 25,000 employees working full-time.⁸ The Subcommittee has attempted to quantify the number of pages required by recipients of federal funds in order to qualify for assistance. Without fully accounting for all the attachments and supplemental submissions required with each application, the Committee counted more than 20,000 pages of applications states must fill out to receive federal education funds each year.

A "Shadow" Department of Education: The Department of Education touts that it is one of the smallest federal agencies with 4,637 employees, and that it has a relatively small administrative budget. What many people do not realize, however, is that there are nearly three times as many federally funded employees of state education agencies administering federal education programs, as there are U.S. Department of Education employees. According to GAO, there are about 13,400 FTEs (full-time equivalents) funded with federal dollars to administer these programs for state education agencies.

As little as 65-70 cents reaches the classroom: A recent study found that for every tax dollar sent to Washington for elementary and secondary education, 85 cents is returned to local school districts. The remaining 15 cents is spend on bureaucracy and national and research programs of unknown effectiveness.⁹ The Department of Education has since released a study, which also found that about 85 cents of federal dollars reaches school districts for use in the classroom.¹⁰ Although these studies provided information not previously available on federal education spending, they only examined what was returned to school districts, still several layers of bureaucracy away from the classroom.

To date, no studies exist to enable us to determine what portion of federal education dollars actually reach the classroom, or what schools and state education agencies must spend to apply for education dollars and comply with their requirements. However, audits of school district spending indicate just how little in general reaches the classroom. A recent audit of the New York City School District found that only 43 percent of the district's total funds were spent on direct classroom expenditures.¹¹ Given the 48.6 million paperwork hours required to receive federal education dollars and the school district bureaucracies funds must pass through to reach the classroom, it is not unreasonable to assume that another 15-20 cents spent outside the classroom. This would mean a net return of 65-70 cents to the classroom.

The 487 Step Labyrinth: In 1993, Vice-President Gore's National Performance Review discovered that the Department of Education's discretionary grant process lasted 26 weeks and took 487 steps from start to finish. It was not until 1996 that the Department finally took steps to begin "streamlining" their long and protracted grant review process, a process that has yet to be completed and fully implemented. After the streamlining is complete it will only take an average of 20 weeks and 216 steps to complete a review.¹²

Federal Dollars for Baywatch and Jerry Springer. The Department of Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services Media and Captioning Services funds closed captioning for "educational" programs such as Baywatch, Ricki Lake, The Montel Williams Show, and Jerry Springer. By funding captioning for these programs—funding which could easily be provided by the television industry or other commercial enterprises—the federal government is demonstrating to the American people just how far away it is from supporting what works and identifying federal education priorities.

Programs for every problem

The massive array of federal education programs was not created overnight, but developed slowly, as an attempt to address specific problems. Each program received minimal funding at the outset, and most have received additional funds from one year to the next. The current arrangement of federal

education funding is as follows: local tax dollars go to Washington, where they are allocated to a variety of purposes, usually to address what someone in the federal government sees as a problem. The money is then returned to the states and school districts in the form of categorical programs. This process puts smaller school districts at a disadvantage: States and local school districts are highly dependent on administrators and skilled grant writers to obtain these federal dollars and comply with their requirements, which places a greater burden on poorer and smaller school systems.

The effectiveness of these programs is seldom measured, even as the problems continue to mount. Evaluations of federal programs almost always measure process, not whether or not they help children learn. For example, the largest education program for disadvantaged children has spent more than \$100 billion over 30 years while producing hardly any evidence of positive, lasting results. Congress must ensure that such wasteful use of tax dollars is stopped.

It is time for the burden of proof to shift to the federal government. If it cannot be demonstrated that a particular federal program is more effectively spending funds than state and local communities would otherwise spend them, Congress should return the money to the states and the people, without any burdensome strings attached. This Subcommittee has found little evidence proving the effectiveness of federal programs, or that federal programs are more effective than local efforts.

Now is the time to act on what we've learned. The central theme of what we learned is that the federal government cannot consistently and effectively replicate success stories throughout the nation in the form of federal programs. Instead, federal education dollars should support effective state and local initiatives, ensuring that it neither impedes local innovation and control, nor diverts dollars from the classroom through burdensome regulations and overhead.

Empower parents

Reduce the family federal tax burden;

Encourage parental choice in education at all levels of government;

Create opportunity scholarships for poor children in Washington, D.C., and other federal empowerment zones;

Allow states to send Title I (Aid to Disadvantaged Students) funds to impoverished parents as grants in order to enable their children to receive additional academic assistance.

Return control to the local level

Return federal elementary and secondary education funds to states and local school districts through flexible grants;

Expand opportunities for waivers from burdensome regulations;

Give states and school districts greater freedom to consolidate program funds to more effectively address pressing needs;

Provide no-strings-attached funds for charter school start-up costs.

Encourage what works in the classroom

Federally funded education programs should only use proven methods backed by reliable, replicable research;

Research and evaluation should concentrate on measuring outcomes and less on process—such as how many children are served by a particular program.

Send dollars to the classroom

Streamline and consolidate federal education programs;

Reform or eliminate ineffective and inefficient programs;

Reduce paperwork burden.

Fifteen years ago our nation was diagnosed as being at risk—at risk of entering the 21st Century lagging behind other industrialized nations economically and educationally. Since then here has been little evidence of the federal government effectively addressing this problem through its hundreds of duplicative and uncoordinated education programs.

In order to address the continued crisis, education policy in this country needs to be re-oriented around ensuring that children receive a quality education, not preserving programs and bureaucracies. Significant progress needs to be made by all levels of government: Solving problems at the federal level is only one component.

Congress has already begun to take action. The findings of the Crossroads Project have underscored an education agenda that has encouraged "flex" grants, parental choice in education, education savings accounts, scholarships for low income children, charter schools, and getting dollars to the classroom.

The federal government should only play a limited role in education; It should serve education at the state and local level as a research and statistics gathering agency, disseminating findings and enabling states to share best practices with each other. Local educators must be empowered to teach children with effective methods and adequate resources, without federal interference. Parents must once again be in charge of the education of their children. Schools should be havens for learning, safe from drugs and violence.

Much work remains. It is time for the federal bureaucracy to move out of the way—to put children first—by supporting what works. The Crossroads Report points the way.

FOOTNOTES

¹Robin H. Carle, Clerk of the House of Representatives, rules of the House of Representatives, Effective for One Hundred Fifth Congress, January 7, 1997.

²National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP 1994 Reading Report Card for the Nation and the States, U.S. Department of Education, March 1996.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

⁶David W. Breneman, "The Extent and Cost of Remediation in Higher Education," Brookings Papers on Education Policy, Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, April, 1998.

⁷U.S. General Accounting Office, Schools and Workplaces: An Overview of Successful and Unsuccessful Practices, GAO/PEMD-95-28, August, 1995, p. 3.

⁸Marshall Smith, "Paper Reduction Act Accomplishments and Plans for Future," U.S. Department of Education, October 31, 1996.

⁹Christine L. Olson, U.S. Department of Education Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education: Where the Money Goes, (Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation), December 30, 1996.

¹⁰U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, The Use of Federal Education Funds for Administrative Costs, 1998, p. 28.

¹¹Jacques Steinberg, "NYC School System Budget Analysis Shows 43% Goes to Classroom," The New York Times, November 21, 1996. See also: Speakman, Cooper, Sampiere, May, Holsomback, Glass, "Bringing Money to the Classroom: A Systemic Resource Model Applied to the New York City Public Schools," Where Does the Money Go? Resource Allocation in Elementary and Secondary Schools, Lawrence O. Picus and James L. Wattenberger, eds., (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 1995).

¹²U.S. Department of Education Report, "A Redesign Discretionary Grant Process"—Vice President Gore's National Performance Review 1995. Redesign process is due to be in place in 1998.