

an officer in the Chinese army and an executive in the Chinese company which (among its many business enterprises) launches satellites, gave him money with instructions to donate a portion of those funds to the Democratic Party.

If substantiated, these assertions could have serious implications. That said, it also should be noted that, provided the safeguards described above do their job, even if a quid pro quo were sought and given, a satellite waiver might work to the commercial advantage of Liu's company, but would not have contributed to China's military capabilities.

In sum, several of the issues being raised in the current controversy are real and serious. Others, particularly those related to charges that satellite launch waivers somehow enhanced Chinese missile capabilities, may be based on fundamentally mistaken premises. Key to making that determination is an assessment of the practical effectiveness of the safeguards policies and practices that apply to these satellite launches.

If careful analysis determines that these safeguards have substantially achieved their objectives, then the imposition of blanket prohibitions on satellite launches by China would largely miss the point. On the one hand, it would not deal with concerns about how campaign contributions—from Americans, to say nothing of Chinese—might influence government decisions in ways which produce commercial advantage. On the other hand, it could prove to be worse than redundant with the safeguards already in place, because it would both place American industry at a competitive disadvantage and do needless damage to our critically important relationship with China.

One fact, however, already is abundantly clear: A great deal is at stake in the answers to the questions being raised in the current controversy. It therefore is essential that we get it right—that all of the charges be thoroughly investigated, that penalties be levied where appropriate, and that remedial actions be taken where required. But we should let the congressional committees do their jobs before a rush to judgment that may harm rather than advance our interests.

HOW TO BUILD A BETTER SCHOOL SYSTEM

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from The Washington Times illustrates why we should help parents send their children to schools of their choice. Mayor Stephen Goldsmith of Indianapolis uses the situation in that city to demonstrate why Catholic schools have been able to perform better than the public schools. I submit the editorial to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOW TO BUILD A BETTER SCHOOL SYSTEM (By Stephen Goldsmith)

President Clinton found ardent supporters of his proposal to invest in public school buildings at a recent meeting with members of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. More money for schools—without having to raise local taxes—is a no-brainer for many mayors seeking an answer to failing urban schools.

Yet there are a handful of mayors from both parties who believe that more than federal dollars are needed to address the real problems facing urban schools. As cities have

experienced the downward spiral of rising taxes, declining enrollment and abysmal students performance, increasingly city leaders are recognizing that lack of money is not what ails our public school systems.

The Indianapolis Public School system is the largest of eleven in this city, responsible for approximately 43,000 students from the central part of the city. During the 1990s the district raised its taxes more than a third, even as enrollment dropped by 10 percent. Not including teacher pensions, IPS spends more than \$9,000 per child—as much if not more than the city's most expensive private schools. If money were the key ingredient for quality schools, students at IPS would rank among the best in the world. Instead, student test scores are among the worst in Indiana—a state that consistently ranks in the bottom 10 percent in the nation.

As the district's declining enrollment makes clear, dissatisfied parents are seeking out alternatives to public schools. While middle and upper class families often either move to the suburbs or pay private school tuition, many less affluent parents have turned to a less expensive choice: Catholic schools.

Like IPS, inner city parochial schools in Indianapolis are racially diverse and serve primarily low income, non-Catholic kids. At St. Philip Neri, a Catholic school on the city's near east side, nearly three quarters of all students qualify for the federal school lunch program, and a similar proportion are not Catholic.

Unlike IPS, tuition at these schools averages a mere \$2700 per child. Yet each year parochial students demonstrate a better grasp of learning fundamentals than students in the public school system. Perhaps even more telling, student performance improves for each year spend in Catholic schools, while scores at IPS decline. In a recent evaluation of standardized test scores, Catholic school third graders held relatively small advantages over IPS students in math and English. By the eighth grade, however, Catholic school students scored nearly twice as high as students in the public system.

There are two important reasons why Catholic schools outperform their public counterparts.

First, they are allowed to succeed. Catholic schools are free from the bloated education bureaucracies that divert tax dollars away from public classrooms. The Friedman Foundation estimates that as little as 30 cents out of every dollar spent on education in Indianapolis actually make their way to the places where children learn. The rest is lost on the layers of bureaucracy between Indiana's Department of Education and teachers. For example, over the next three years the IPS Service Center, which houses support services such as vehicle maintenance, media services, and a print shop, will undertake a nearly \$7.5 million capital improvement project. The task: constructing a new kitchen.

In addition to siphoning off dollars, the school bureaucracy undermines public education by dictating in great detail how principals can run their schools and teachers can teach their students. The morass of regulations governing public education prevents teachers from tailoring their teaching to the diverse needs of students and taking innovative approaches to educating. Not coincidentally, some of the best IPS schools are those at which teachers routinely disregard many of these rules, using their own choice of textbooks, curricula, and teaching methods to ensure that kids learn.

The other reason that Catholic schools succeed is equally simple: they have to. If St. Philip Neri fails to satisfy its customers, parents will take their tuition dollars else-

where. In contrast, customer satisfaction is irrelevant to public schools, especially those serving low income families. Government simply tells these parents which school their children must attend, and parents who cannot afford a private alternative have no choice but to send their children there, regardless of how poorly that school performs.

If we are committed to giving all our children an opportunity, we must apply to the public school system the same simple principles that enable private and parochial schools to succeed.

In Indianapolis, our experience with allowing public employees and private companies to compete for contracts to provide city services has consistently demonstrated that competition improves government-run enterprises. For each of the 75 services subjected to competition, marketplace pressure has exploded bureaucracies, reducing layers of management, empowering workers, and refocusing these agencies on satisfying their customers. In order to win business, public employees have cut their own budgets while improving service quality, dramatically outperforming their previous, better-funded monopoly.

The same competitive forces can empower public schools to succeed. Committed reformers have offered numerous proposals to break up the government school monopoly and empower public schools to educate more effectively, including vouchers, charter schools, and the education savings accounts currently before Congress. Unfortunately, the president's threatened veto of the education savings proposal demonstrates that this administration continues to believe that any problem can be cured with more federal dollars.

Forcing lower income parents to send their children to poorly performing schools (even in nice buildings) will not improve the prospects of urban youths. What our cities' mayors should be advocating for in Washington is not simply more money to support a failing school bureaucracy, but more help for parents to send their children to the schools of their choice.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2400, BUILDING EFFICIENT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND EQUITY ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 22 1998

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science whose jurisdictional area of expertise includes transportation research and development once again is pleased to have worked closely with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in efforts to strengthen the research program of the Department of Transportation by first developing a comprehensive research title for the House version of this legislation and later by serving as conferees on the research title.

I would like to thank Chairmen SHUSTER and PETRI as well as Ranking Democratic Members OBERSTAR and RAHALL for their cooperation in bringing a research title to the floor which incorporated most of the significant provisions reported by the Committee on Science and for working with us to ensure that the House comprehensive research program prevailed in conference to the extent possible. I

believe our cooperative efforts in 1992 contributed significantly to the strengthening of Department of Transportation surface transportation research in the ensuing years; I am equally convinced that our efforts during 1997 and 1998 will take these research programs to a higher level. While I am deeply disappointed with how a handful of provisions turned out, overall I feel this legislation is an improvement over existing law.

Unfortunately, the Statement of Managers for the bill before us omitted the explanation of all of the research title except for the Intelligent Transportation System. While many of these provisions are clear on their face, I feel in other instances, an explanation of Congressional intent should be included in the legislative history. Therefore, at this point, I would like to discuss a number of these provisions for which the Science Committee leadership served as conferees and where Science Committee members had concerns.

Section 5108, entitled Surface Transportation Research Strategic Planning, makes it clear that the Secretary is to oversee an integrated planning process in consultation with all other Federal agencies involved in surface transportation research, State and Local governments, and private sector organizations involved in surface transportation research to make sure that the Department's efforts have a strategic focus, clear goals, and measurable results. This section builds on the work the Department has begun under the guidance of the Deputy Secretary. The language retains other important features from our Committee's work product including tie-ins to the Government Performance and Results Act, outside review of Department plans, emphasis on merit review, and tying in the plans, research and results of each Departmental research program to this planning effort.

Section 5102, Surface Transportation Research, ended up containing programs which originated in Committee-passed sections dealing with research, technology development, and technology transfer. Among the items of importance to the Committee on Science are the new 23 USC 502(c)(2) and (f) which provide for research, development, and technology transfer related to surface transportation infrastructure such as enhancing emphasis on seismic research and on demonstrating innovative recycled materials, especially the use of paper and plastics to replace metal mesh in reinforced highway concrete. The Committee also placed strong emphasis on increasing the knowledge base necessary for state and local governments to do contracting based on life cycle cost analysis including the development of standardized estimates for the useful life of advanced highway and infrastructure materials. The Committee is well aware that if the useful life of the average highway could be extended by just one year, that the entire surface transportation research program of the Federal government could be paid for many times over and is interested in stopping the phenomenon of the products of advanced research sitting on the shelf because local contracting officers are either unfamiliar with them or do not know how to evaluate their usefulness.

Section 5104, Training and Education, continues a variety of training and scholarship programs of the Department. The Committee through language now included at 23 USC 504(b)(2)(A)(i) had interest in strengthening

undergraduate training and technical assistance to local transportation agencies through programs such as the Middle Tennessee Graduate 2000 program which was designed in conjunction with the concrete industry and state officials to assure an adequate supply of bachelor level professionals who are knowledgeable about the concrete industry and capable of making decisions related to the adoption of new technologies. We feel this is a necessary complement to our changes in Section 5102. Even if we are successful in getting the Department to fund research on life cycle costing and to develop standardized estimates of useful lives for new technologies, these are unlikely to be utilized in the absence of a technologically educated workforce.

Section 5107, the Surface Transportation-Environment Cooperative Research Program, is an idea promoted both by the Senate and by the Committee on Science. Its goal is to promote an increased awareness of the environmental and social impacts of transportation decisions through research to better understand factors related to transportation demand, by developing indicators of economic, social, and environmental performance of transportation systems, and by establishing an Advisory Board to recommend environmental and energy conservation research, technology and technology transfer activities related to surface transportation.

Section 5110, is one section with a disappointing final form. While we appreciate the Conference Committee's retention of our emphasis on merit selection of University Transportation Research Centers, we feel it is a mistake to list 21 recipients of earmarks and to mandate those earmarks in specific amounts for six years. This defeats both the principle of awarding contracts to the most qualified institutions and of continuing funding only for those institutions which perform satisfactorily under the grants. The House version of this legislation listed a number of other locations which Members of Congress considered to have meritorious programs and required the Secretary to consider applications for these institutions while not requiring actual rewards. For instance, under the House provision, which we considered to be preferable, the Secretary would have considered applications from schools like Middle Tennessee State University, Tennessee Technological University, and the University of Maryland which our membership considers to have sophisticated transportation programs, but the Secretary would only have awarded and renewed grants to these institutions if the applications from the school was meritorious and its performance under existing grants was satisfactory.

We are in agreement with the Statement of Managers language on the Intelligent Transportation System Subtitle and were pleased to be able to make a contribution to it. Our Committee's main emphases were expedited standards development for the intelligent transportation systems (ITS) program to decrease the chance of deployment of incompatible systems, increased data collection and information sharing responsibilities for recipients of grants for ITS operational tests or deployment, making sure that adequate attention is paid to the basic and human factors research related to ITS, and making sure that the special needs of ITS in cold climates were addressed.

I would like to close by commenting on the bill's removal of the deadline for conversion of highway construction to the metric system of measurement and its deferring to the states in this matter. This modification does not change the basic underlying facts that metric is still by law the preferred system of measurement in the United States, that U.S. government procurement and business related activities are to be conducted in metric, and that the rest of the world is moving to metric at a very rapid clip. Metric is the official system of measurement throughout Asia; all regulations in the European Union are being written in metric. Metric measurement is the standard throughout the Americas including Mexico and Canada. Metric measurement is rapidly becoming predominant in U.S. highway construction. Fortunately, this provision is not expected to bring much change. A quick survey of the states has shown that 90 percent of them do not plan to exercise this option and revert to the English system of measurement.

HONORING LORI PARCEL

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Lori Parcel of Greenwood, Indiana in my District is the winner of the 1998 Voice of Democracy broadcast scriptwriting contest for Indiana. I am pleased to present her winning script for the RECORD.

Who hasn't solved a jigsaw puzzle? We all have been faced with the task of one time or another. I remember the last time I tried to solve one. After hours of work, the puzzle was nearly complete . . . and then I realized that some of the pieces were missing. I scoured the area in search of the missing pieces, but I was unable to find them. The puzzle remained incomplete. In many ways, our democracy is a puzzle that consists of over 250 million pieces. Over 250 million voices which are inextricably bound. And interlocked within this tapestry, the tapestry of democracy, is my voice.

I realize that all of the pieces of the puzzle must be present for our government to be fully effective. However, looking around, I can't help but notice gaps in democracy's tapestry. Gaps which surely weaken the entire structure. I raise my voice to cry out to the missing pieces, to tell them to join the majority of Americans, to exchange ideas and strengthen our government, but my cry does not reach some. They do not understand that by discounting their own voices, and by ignoring my plea, they are hurting both themselves and our government. They do not realize that a democracy such as ours cannot effectively operate without their input. I use my voice to tell them about the time I was paging in the state legislature. I tell of a man who came into the statehouse and observed me tallying opinion surveys. The man, presumably a stray piece, was surprised that the surveys were tallied. He expressed his astonishment by saying, "That's where those surveys go. You actually read these. I did not think anyone listened, or that it was worth spending money for a stamp." The man did not understand that the absence a single voice, a solitary note in the symphony of our government, can throw harmony into discord.

I plea to the stray pieces once again. I tell them that, during my experience paging, I