

they have all these other risk factors that are markedly reduced. In regard to alcohol, 20 percent of the kids who are not sexually active use alcohol. Of the kids that are sexually active, almost 65 percent do. And these are males. We can go down the line. Dropping out of school, threefold increase. Use of other drugs, 4½ to 5 times increase if they are sexually active. They are five times more likely to use an illicit drug than if they are not sexually active.

What is the number one connection here? It is how well are they connected to their parents or parent, and we know that. We see similar patterns just with this on females. We see the same pattern if our youngsters are abstinent, that the risk factors for other risks that will markedly impact their life goes way down. So it is an indicator of what they are going to be exposed to and what other risks are going to be put on them in their life.

What we saw from this adolescent study from 1993 is that when the relationship was good with mom, and mom was opposed to premarital sex, and when discussions of birth control, of how to not get pregnant, are decreased, not increased, they were 12 times more likely to have a youngster that would not be sexually active than ones whose parents talked about, "Here is how you protect yourself and it is okay to be sexually active."

So what we have done is set a trap for our kids. If we are accepting of a behavior that puts them at risk and we talk about how to minimally protect them, what we are doing is dooming them to failure and to a sexually transmitted disease.

So what are the other factors that we found? Parent connectedness, parent disapproval of sexual activity, parent disapproval of sexual adolescent contraceptive use.

School is real important. The school connectedness is related to parent connectedness, attending a parochial school or school with high average daily attendance.

What are the individual factors? We have seen through programs like "True Love Waits" and "Best Friends," that a commitment to remain sexually pure works wonderfully. Our children respond to it. High grade point average. A religion. Jewish, Muslim, Protestant, Catholic. The fact that the faith is impacting their life.

So, what is the answer? We have 12 million new sexually transmitted diseases a year. We have a million people with AIDS, with HIV. We have had nearly a half million die from it. We have 4 million people that are going to die from hepatitis C or they are going to get a liver transplant. What is the answer? What is the answer for our children?

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a new sexual revolution. It is time for the revolution of the 1960s and the 1970s to die. Why? Because it is morally wrong. But there are consequences to morally

wrong behavior. And the morally wrong behavior is that we have an epidemic that is out of control in our Nation.

Abstinence until entering into a committed, lifelong, mutually faithful, monogamous relationship. That is called marriage. Marriage is a wonderful institution. It does us well as a society. We should do everything we can to support that institution, because that oftentimes protects us.

Abstinence until marriage and faithfulness in marriage that is supported by our society. That is supported. That is condoned by our society. Where our society stands up and says, Stay together. Do not violate the principle.

Who benefits from character-based abstinence education? The answer is all of us. It is them and it is us. It is our Nation. It is our budget. It is the life, health, and well-being of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I say: America, wake up. Twelve million new infections every year and none of them have to be. Let us ask for the truth. Let us ask the CDC to do its job. Let us make sure we teach our children what the risk factors are. Let us make sure we talk about that there are consequences to sexual activity outside of marriage, and many of them are very, very grave.

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

#### EXPUNGING OF REMARKS FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any portion of my remarks that referred to the President be expunged from the special order that was delivered this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNOWBARGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, tonight we want to begin a dialogue that we hope sets the framework for tomorrow. Tomorrow, there is going to be limited debate on a bill that is coming to the floor. It is called "Dollars to the Classroom."

This piece of legislation, which was authored by a colleague of mine from Pennsylvania, builds on a previous resolution that this House has passed. What that resolution said was that when we send a dollar to Washington for education, instead of getting 60 to 70 cents of that dollar back to the classroom, back to the local level, we are going to strive to get that up to 90 to 95 cents of every education dollar getting back to a local classroom.

Before I do that, and before I begin that discussion on education, I want to

set the framework. A while back, we did a proposal out of my office, or we did kind of an analysis, and we started addressing an issue which I think is very important. The question was: Why is it that everyone has so much faith in Washington?

□ 2200

Why is it that people believe that if they send their money to Washington, Washington is better at building their roads, Washington is better at educating their children, Washington is better at creating jobs than if we left that money at the State or local level or if we left that money in the pockets of the American citizens?

We identified a phenomenon which we call "the myth of the magical bureaucracy." What we said is, we really should ask some questions. Do we really believe that a bureaucrat in Washington can raise our children? Do we really believe that this magical bureaucracy here in Washington can build and strengthen our communities, that it can create economic growth, that it can create economic opportunity and that it can prepare America for the information age?

It is kind of interesting, my colleague from Colorado and I today had the opportunity to ask that question, not can the magical bureaucracy here in Washington prepare America for the information age, but the question that we asked today is whether the magical bureaucracy, not whether it can lead us into the information age but whether this magical bureaucracy here in Washington, in the two departments we had testify today, the Education and Labor Departments, whether they are even prepared to move into the information age and whether they are prepared to deal with the year 2000 issue. And the answers that we got were fairly frightening.

The Education Department, this is a group that sends out money to our schools; it does Pell grants. It does the direct student loan program. In reality, the Education Department is perhaps one of the largest banks in the country. Its loan portfolio or the loans that it manages are close to \$150 billion. It has roughly 93 million customers, 93 million people who have loans with the Education Department.

In a recent scoring or a grading, which I think is very appropriate for the Education Department, one of my colleagues from another committee in the House of Representatives said that they, the Education Department, deserved an F. They are not ready for the year 2000. It means that we are not quite sure what happens to the \$150 billion of loans that are outstanding. We are not quite sure what will happen to our students who in 1999 begin applying for loans or start going to school and believe they are approved for loans and start actually looking for the money and do not receive their checks.

It is kind of scary what is going to happen potentially with the Education