five and nine, depending on the country), students are put in different tracks, each demanding, on the basis of their achievement.

There are no such standards here. Efforts to establish national standards have been particularly controversial, but if other democratic countries with a range of political ideologies have been able to work them out, couldn't we? The public seems to want us to. The Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll has included different questions about national standards, and support has ranged from 69% to 83%.

State standards have made more headway, but almost none of them gives real guidance to teachers. Many are vague: e.g., learn to appreciate literature. Some are so encyclopedic that each teacher has to decide what to do.

The public demands more. According to the 1994 Public Agenda survey, 82% of Americans favor ''setting up very clear guidelines on what kids should learn and teachers should teach in every major subject.'' And the 1995 Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll shows that 87% of Americans think students ought to meet ''higher standards than are now required in math, English, history, and science in order to graduate from high school.''

The disconnect between the public and public officials is also large on the issue of tracking. American schools, like school systems in other countries, track students, but we do it poorly and unfairly. One way to turn that around is to do what other nations do: Have common high standards in the early grades and ensure that students in different tracks in the later grades all have challenging standards to meet and second chances to move to higher tracks. Instead, public officials are jumping on the de-tracking bandwagon, the idea that a 10th-grader who is at, say, a fifth-grade reading level should be taught in the same class as students at the 10th-grade level. Why? To avoid the harmful effects of labeling some students as ''slow,'' or to see if lower achieving students will rise to the level of high achievers.

This is clearly unworkable. What's a teacher supposed to do—teach the same lesson to all? Divide the class into groups, and give each group only a small amount of attention? Ah, we're told, with lots of time, training and other expensive changes, teachers may learn new methods that work.

The public is not buying. According to a 1994 survey by the Public Agenda Foundation, ''only 34% of Americans think that mixing students of different achievement levels together in classes . . . will help increase student learning. People remain skeptical about this strategy even when presented with arguments in favor of it . . . [because it] seems to fly in the face of their real-world experiences.''

The third essential element of successful school systems is external testing that is administered by state or national governments. Secondary school students abroad know that being admitted into a university or technical institute or getting a good job depends on passing rigorous external exams. Most nations' college-entrance exams cover four to seven subjects, each taking about six to eight hours of essay writing and problem solving. About 30% of all students pass them. There are also rigorous exams to enter technical schools.

In the U.S., we have no comparable curriculum-based exams, though the old New York State Regents exams can the closest. The Advanced Placement exams are somewhat comparable but are not required; only 7% of students take them. Standardized reading and math tests given in all schools measure only those skills and don't measure students' performance against objective standards. Minimum competency tests for 12th-grade graduation typically measure seventh- or eighth-grade skills. None of this satisfies the public's demand for high standards.

The fourth element of successful education systems is high stakes for student achievement—the glue that holds the other elements together. Students in other countries study hard because they know that unless they pass their exams, they will not get into a college, technical institute or apprenticeship program. They may not even get a job because employers hire on the basis of school records.

In the U.S., almost nothing counts for students—not grades, not behavior, not even attendance. There is a college willing to take all hopefuls in America, no matter what courses they took or what grades and SAT or ACT scores they received. Eighty-nine percent of four-year colleges offer remediation. Those not headed for college needn't worry either. Employers do care whether the applicant is a graduate or dropout, but they don't ask for the student's academic and behavioral record.

NOT ON THE AGENDA

Without high stakes, students won't work hard and, therefore, won't learn much. But this is not on the American political agenda. Liberal politicians say it is unfair to hold children accountable until we equalize the resources spent on them. Conservatives seem no more eager than liberals. They spend their time placing blame for low student achievement on teachers' unions, tenure and government monopoly of education—each of which is present in successful school systems.

The liberals' solution for low academic achievement is to push social engineering first, which has little public support. The conservatives' solution is to push vouchers, which haven't improved achievement and which according to the 1995 Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll, are opposed by 65% of Americans. And both sides, for different reasons, are embracing an even greater degree of the local control that brought us to this state of low achievement in the first place.

The American public and parents want high standards of conduct and achievement in our public schools. Surveys of teachers show the same. They're right: Discipline and academic standards work and are workable. Smart politicians should propose this as an Educational Contract with America and deliver.

IN HONOR OF THE LINDEN INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION ON ITS 60TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1995

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Linden Industrial Association, an association that has represented the city of Linden's manufacturing industry with diligence and professionalism, on its 60th anniversary. The association will celebrate its anniversary on September 27 at a special event entitled ''Linden—2000 and Beyond.''

The organization was formed in 1935 to assist the city in formulating its budget each year. As time passed the organization evolved—now its main purpose is to create a strong business climate for its members. The association also works to inform its members about environmental and safety regulations. The association promotes sound business practices and corporate responsibility.

Sixty-five corporations are members of the association, such giants ranging in size from Merck & Co., General Motors and Exxon Chemical and including smaller companies as well. New and old businesses receive excellent guidance from the association that leads to long and prosperous business relationships. The association aims to keep communication open between industry, business, and government. The association has often been compared to a chamber of commerce. Their purpose is to help the businesses and to provide as much support and information as possible.

I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the Linden Industrial Association on its 60th year anniversary. The association is truly a remarkable organization that strives to provide better service to its members.

HONORING DAVID L. PHILLIPS

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago Congress appointed David L. Phillips to serve as the first president of the Congressional Human Rights Foundation. David was an outstanding leader who served Congress and the Foundation with distinction.

Unfortunately, David's 7-year term is now ending, but he can leave the Foundation knowing he played a critical role in establishing the Foundation as a promoter for human rights and democracy around the world.

Under David's leadership, the Foundation established the Interparliamentary Human Rights Network which includes members from 120 countries devoted to human rights and democracy.

The Foundation's Board of Directors recently honored David by approving a resolution commending David's 7-year term. The resolution is printed below.

As David leaves to pursue new opportunities, I urge my colleagues to join me in extending a warm appreciation to David for his efforts and contributions during the past 7 years and a sincere wish for continued success.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, David L. Phillips was appointed by Members of the U.S. Congress to serve as the first President of the Congressional Human Rights Foundation in 1988.

Whereas, David L. Phillips ably established the Foundation as a leading voice on behalf of human rights and democracy and helped to define the purpose and future of the organization during his seven year term as President of the Foundation.

Whereas, David L. Phillips worked assiduously on behalf of the victims of human rights abuse bringing to bear a deep humanitarian commitment to the well-being of human-kind as the redress of human suffering.

Whereas, David L. Phillips leadership the Foundation's Interparliamentary Human Rights Network was established and today includes 1,000 Members of Parliament from 120 countries committed to human rights and democracy.

Whereas, David L. Phillips helped establish the Foundation's Global Democracy Network, an electronic communications program which utilizes the information highway