to use it, what results you were going to get. That is the money that has been used in North Carolina, and I would assume in the other 49 States and territories, to allow for the reform, the change that is now taking place all across this country.

I thank the gentleman, and I hope we can get back and spend a whole evening on this whole issue of academic reform and accountability in these areas, and talk about assessment, because I feel very strongly about it and I think the American people do. I thank the gentleman for joining me.

WHY NOT HAVE NATIONAL TESTS FOR MATH AND SCIENCE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. REDMOND]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is recognized for half of the remaining time until midnight, approximately 45 minutes.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss a topic that has also been discussed earlier tonight, and that is the question of education.

I cannot help but comment on my colleagues who were just here on the floor before me. In just a few moments of listening to them I heard one of them, a gentleman who was previously in the educational establishment, either a principal or a superintendent of a school district, say that he supports good education and therefore, supports a voluntary national testing program.

It is, indeed, that subject that I want to talk about tonight, because it is a topic that is very close to me. I have back home in Arizona right now a 13-year-old daughter who is a freshman at Thunderbird High School in the Phoenix area, excuse me, a sophomore, and struggling to get through her education this year, and to try to get into the best school in terms of college that she can possibly get into. I have an 11-year-old son who is in grade school.

Their education is vitally important to me, because I understand that in this global economy we are in, precisely how well they do in pursuing their education goals will determine in many ways to a great extent how well they do throughout the rest of their lives. There simply is no issue which is, at core, more important to me, and more important in a Nation where we are founded on the notion of universal public schools.

I listened to my colleagues from the other side of the aisle talk about public schools and the importance of public schools, yet I have to tell the Members, there are a couple of things that I resent. I want to talk about those tonight. I resent it when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle allege that they are the only ones who care about education and the only ones who care about public education. I think it is wrong to cast those kinds of aspersions and make those kinds of value judgments, because some of us view this issue differently than they do.

I was educated in public schools all the way through, never attended a day of private school in my entire life. Not from kindergarten through law school did I attend anything but public schools. My children are in public schools now. I believe very much in a quality public education.

But just because I believe in that does not mean I have to accept their view of the world, or even the professional educators' view of the world or, as I like to call them, the educrats' view of the world or the Federal Department of Education's view of the world. Instead, I bring to this debate my own rational thought, my own experience about education, my own views about the importance of public education, but mostly about quality education; about challenging my daughter Courtney to do her best every day in school; and about challenging my son Stephen to do his best every day in school.

I listened to the other side and they touched upon this issue of testing, national testing. That is a major topic that I want to talk about tonight. I want to talk about how some of us can believe and believe very strongly that as good and as apple pie and as motherhood and as all-American as national testing sounds, that we can look at our children and see how they are doing in Minnesota versus Arizona, as good as those things sound, in point of fact I believe and I believe deeply that national testing, if we mean by that federally dictated testing, tests written at the Federal Department of Education in Washington, D.C., thousands of miles from my home in Moon Valley, Arizona, if we mean by that a national testing written by a committee set up by this President, or for that matter any other President, if we mean one single uniform Federal test applied to every student in America, and we will judge every student in America by how they do on that test, I submit, it is not only bad, and a bad idea, it could be disastrous.

That does not mean that I do not support education. What it means is that when I look at the idea of one Federal test, I recognize that we are placing all of our eggs in one basket. If that test is written badly, if that test is written, as I fear the test might be written, to test the current fads in education, the newest whole math or new math or the newest whole language or whole English, or some other popular fad within the education establishment, not only will the test not measure real performance by my children, by my daughter Courtney or my son Stephen, but instead, it will do massive damage, and damage to every boy and every girl in public and private school in America, at a time when in this global economy we cannot tolerate that.

Why do I say that? How could just doing a national test, how could just having a national test, how could a national test which was voluntary, and my colleague pointed out that he could not understand, how could a national test that was voluntary be dangerous? How could it be a problem?

I listened to him, and I think many people who view this issue from that standpoint are honest and genuine and sincere, and I can even understand their point. Instead, I get many of my colleagues back home, many of my friends back home, who say, well, explain to me what your concern is about national testing. Why is that such a bad idea? Why should we not have a single test to test the skills of our children across America, so we can look at how they do?

Let me make a point here. I just had a friend move from Arizona to New Jersey this last year. His two boys, a little bit older than my children, are now in high school in New Jersey. He thinks they are being challenged more rigorously in New Jersey than they were in Arizona. So why should we not be able to test that?

A few years ago I had a good friend who moved from Tucson, Arizona, to Maryland, not far from here, Potomac, Maryland. He felt his children were being challenged better at their new school than at their old school. So what can be wrong with national testing, particularly if it is voluntary?

Let me explain that, for people who are listening and watching, and for my colleagues who care about this debate. The problem with national testing begins with the issue of what do tests do. Tests set a benchmark. They set, in and of themselves, an educational standard. They say, we are going to test these subjects and these matters, and if you want your students to do well, they had better know these subjects and these answers. They had better know what is going to be tested and how to answer those questions.

What I am saying here is that my children's teachers, and indeed, I think my teachers and all teachers across America, to a certain degree in a very positive sense, teach to the test; that is, they understand what the students whose lives and whose education they have been entrusted with are going to be tested on, and so they want to be sure that they have that knowledge. If math is going to be tested, they will stress math.

But then the question comes, what about math? What within math does the test test, because I need to make sure as a teacher that my students know those skills that will be tested?

So I believe that one fact we have to begin to entertain a discussion of this topic of a national test is if we agree as a Nation to have a single Federal test, written in Washington, D.C. by the Federal Department of Education or by some consultant hired by the Department of Education, we need to understand that every conscientious teacher in America in public schools, in private schools, wherever, my children's teachers in the Washington Elementary

School District in Phoenix, Arizona, will want to know what is in that test and will want to know what skills my children need to learn to do well on that test.

And they should do that. My teachers must have taught me the skills that were going to be tested, because I was able to make it through my education through grade school and high school into college and on into law school. So someone taught me what was going to be tested on the test.

So we should begin the debate by understanding that this voluntary testing program that my colleagues seem to think is such a great idea in fact is in itself setting a national standard.

Now, you say, well, what is wrong with that? What is the problem with setting a national standard? In a minute I am going to talk about some of the substantive problems in setting a national standard, but first I want to deal with the issue of voluntary.

How can it be a problem if this is voluntary? Congressman, how can it be a problem if we have national test, but you can choose or you cannot choose to have your students in your school or your school district school take that test? The answer is simple and straightforward.

In education in America there are very, very few, a relatively small number of textbook writers. If we as a Nation establish a national test, that tests, for example, math and science, even if we leave out a national test on social studies or some other more controversial topics, then there will be math and science texts written all across America to teach what is on that national test. It is the marketplace. It is reality.

So when the parents and the teachers in my school district, the Washington School District in Phoenix, Arizona, want to select a text, most of the texts they will have to choose from, most of the textbooks that they could give to my student, my child, or my son or my daughter in school in Phoenix, Arizona, will be texts, textbooks that are written to that national test.

So voluntariness at that moment goes pretty much out the window, because we will have a national test, and we will understand that everyone in America is going to be judged on that, and the textbook writers will understand if kids need to learn to pass that test, they need to have a textbook that gives them those subject matters and teaches them the skills to pass that test.

So the notion of, well, it is just voluntary, they can opt not to do it, turns out to be a ruse, a charade, not real, because every teacher in America first will want to teach to the test, because he or she will care about their students' performance. Teachers are genuine, caring, loving people who want their students to do best. So they will teach to that national test. But for a school that wants to opt out, they will feel have a limited choice, because virtually all of the textbooks will be written to that national test.

Why is there then a problem with a national test? Here I want to turn to some experts who have greater experience and knowledge than I do. I have to tell you that when I entered this debate I was not sure that national tests were a bad idea. I had not thought through the idea of teachers teaching to the test. I had not thought through the idea of textbooks being written by the handful of textbook companies in America to that test.

So I did not instantaneously say, this is a bad idea. As a matter of fact, I was much like most Americans who say, gee, what is wrong with a national test? As a matter of fact, I read a syndicated columnist today about how he had gotten into the cab in a major city, here in town, and the cab driver engaged him in a discussion of this issue of national tests. I think America is engaged in that debate. I think they are uncertain about this issue. That is why I wanted to talk about it tonight.

Let me turn to the experts. One of the experts in field, someone I respect a lot, is a woman by the name of Lynn Cheney. Lynn Cheney is a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, and her work in this area I think is very important for all Americans to read and understand, because this is an important issue to every American. What could be more important than our children's education?

What debate is greater than this question about national tests? The President on the floor of this very House from that dais right there told America in his State of the Union this year that he was going to impose national, that is, federally-written, Washington, D.C. tests in math and science, and he called America to rally to that cause.

I am standing here tonight saying, we ought not to rally to that cause. Let me make it clear why. Ms. Cheney in a recent article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on September 29 addressed this issue. Her column is headed, ''A Failing Grade for Clinton's National Standards.'' Remember, national tests will set national standards.

She begins her column by pointing out that, ''A consultant who sits on the President's committee overseeing the proposed national mathematics exam had written an essay, and in this essay, he explained his views of education.'' It turns out this consultant is not alone. His views are shared by apparently hundreds of mathematics teachers across America, because the test that he advocates he is also helping write for an association of math teachers across America. He is also a consultant to the education department of the State of Connecticut. His name is Stephen Leinwand. I do not know that that matters.

But what he wrote in the essay, according to Ms. Cheney, was that it is downright dangerous to teach students things like 6 times 7 is 42.

□ 2245

''Put down the 2 and carry the 4.'' It is dangerous, he wrote in this essay, to teach children basic mathematical computational skills. Indeed, he goes on to articulate in this article that he does not think we should teach children any calculation skills that involve whole number computation. We have to say, why? Are we missing something here?

The answer is straightforward. He writes if we teach children that 6 times 7 is 42, we will be, and I quote, ''anointing the few'', who master this skill, who learn that 6 times 7 is 42, and learn the rest of the multiplication tables or the division tables. He says we will be anointing the few who master these skills, and I quote, ''casting out the many.''

The bottom line in his view of the world is that we should not teach addition, subtraction, multiplication and division to the students in America, and since we should not teach it, he believes fervently and he advocates we should not test it. We should not teach and we should not test basic mathematical skills to our children in schools in America today because we will be sorting people out. That is, we will be anointing the few and rewarding those who get the answer right, and we will be casting out the many who fail.

Well, I happen to disagree with his numbers right there because I think children in America, the vast majority, do learn the multiplication tables and addition, subtraction, and division, and so we are not anointing the few and casting out many, but we are learning to teach children that there are skills that they will need in their life.

Mr. Leinwand goes on in his essay and explains why the committee on which he sits, a committee which is helping to write the proposed national test, recommends a national math exam that would avoid directly assessing certain knowledge and skills such as whole number computation, and that is a quote.

So, he is anxious to test America and to have a national math test. He is on the President's committee to write this math test, but the test should not test basic knowledge and skills such as whole number computation, that is addition, subtraction, multiplication and division, because we will make children, to put it simply, feel bad. Mr. Leinwand thinks that is a bad idea.

The school that Mr. Leinwand comes from is a whole math school or a new math school. There are other articles that talk about it. Lynne Cheney wrote in the Weekly Standard of August 4 in which she talks about the entire school in America of math teachers who believe that we must throw out computational skills and teach whole math and what is also called in different lingo, ''fuzzy math'' or ''new math.''

Some may believe that new math is the greatest thing in the world and may want their child taught that, but

what I want to point out in discussing this issue is that the potential disaster here is a national one if we set a national test that all children must learn and pass.

If the education establishment in Washington, DC, captures this idea, if the President succeeds in convincing Americans that, by gosh, if we care about our kids we must have a national test, and we write one test and it is fatally flawed because it tests not addition, multiplication, subtraction or division but tests only the newest fad in math, fuzzy math or new math, we will be forever condemning at least a generation of America's children to not learning the basic skills they need.

Mr. Leinwand defends his stand saying, Listen, it is more important that kids be able to think their way through problems. I agree. I think kids ought to be able to think through problems. And he defends his position by saying everybody in America uses a calculator and they ought to be able to bring a calculator to school, do the calculations themselves.

Mr. Speaker, that is a great idea, but I have had the experience of picking up a calculator and using it and looking at the answer and saying wait a minute, that answer is wrong. Sometimes the electronic devices that we rely upon go bad. Somebody spills their glass of water or something on the calculator and the answer we get is wrong. If students were never taught in school addition, subtraction, multiplication and division, then how are they going to have a gut feeling for what is right or wrong?

That concern was expressed by a fellow Arizonian. Marianne Moody Jennings is a woman whom I admire in Arizona. I have never had the pleasure of meeting her, but she became interested in this issue as well. She wrote a column called ''MTV Math Does Not Add Up.'' She is, herself, a professor at Arizona State University. She is the director of the Lincoln Center for Applied Ethics at Arizona State University. Here is her experience with this issue.

She has young children like I do. She said one evening she came home and her blood began to boil because she witnessed her daughter, who I am sure she was a grade school student, I do not know, was at home doing her math home work and she was using a calculator to compute 10 percent of 470.

Think of it. Do we need a generation of Americans, do we need to decide in this Nation that basic math skills are so unimportant that for a task as 10 percent of 470 they need a calculator? And if we do, who at some point in the history of this world will know whether the calculators are right or wrong?

Ms. Jennings became supremely upset about this and began to teach her daughter that she should learn those math skills herself and that the calculation of 10 percent of 470 should be one that she could do in her head in a nanosecond.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, one of the things that we begin to see in supermarkets are the calculators on the carts. As a practical matter, as somebody who has a business degree as opposed to a law degree, one of the great tactics is to change the size of the box so the new larger style actually has a bigger box but sometimes less in it.

If shoppers cannot do basic math on their feet, they are ripe to be taken advantage of in every supermarket aisle, in every toy department, in every department store. And I say this as somebody who has been and my family have always been retailers, but if people cannot do basic math, they are not going to be able to figure out what is the best buy.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is exactly right. Our children in America need these basic skills and they are vitally important. If we say to them, as this national math association proposes to say, and they already by the way have on their tests, those written by I think the National Association of Math Teachers, they have already decreased rather dramatically the amount that current tests used in schools across America test basic skills. But if we adopt a national test, an examination that does not test any or tests almost no basic skills, does not ask eighth graders if they can, without a calculator, add, subtract, divide, multiply basic calculations, we are condemning them to precisely what the gentleman points out. We are condemning an entire Nation to be taken advantage of.

More importantly, we are putting ourselves at a huge disadvantage. But I want to make the point that this is not a debate about Bill Clinton and his test proposal. It is not a debate about Steven Leinwand. It is not a debate about whether we like or do not like the Federal Department of Education. It is not a debate about whether we like or do not like new math or whole English. That is not the issue.

The issue here is a more fundamental one and it is nothing less than, to use a government term, Federalism. But Federalism is nothing more than the expression of belief in individuals to address and solve their own problems.

What really is applied here is the proposition that the parents and the teachers and the administrators at the school down the street from my house, at Lookout Mountain Elementary where my son Stephen goes, or Thunderbird High where my daughter Courtney goes, that those parents and those teachers and those students and those administrators can do a better job of figuring out education at that school. And certainly the Arizona Department of Education, which gets somewhat involved in these issues, can do a better job of listening to the people of the Arizona and they can make those decisions for themselves.

But I mention the word ''Federalism.'' I am not just against national standards because I do not like the Department of Education and I do like the people at my children's schools. I am not just against it because I do not trust Bill Clinton and I do trust the principal at Courtney's school and Stephen's schools. I am against it for a bigger reason and that is the whole notion of Federalism.

It was a part of the genius of this Nation. It was if we had a Nation that was one Nation but made up of 50 different States as we have now come to be, and if we said that basic national policies, national defense, foreign trade, and trade between the States could be regulated by Congress and the Federal Government, but if we left the other decisions, for example decisions about the education of our children, to those 50 different States and to the little communities and localities within those States, the school board association in my neighborhood, then if one of those schools had a great idea, they could pursue that idea and maybe do a great job and it would be picked up in some other State. Or if one a bad idea, and I suggest Mr. Leinwand's idea in my view is a bad idea, and if the State of Connecticut wants to pay him to teach and write a test that does not test the eighth graders in Connecticut basic math skills, so be it. Maybe in 10 years, the Connecticut schools and the schoolchildren will be way ahead of the Arizona schools and schoolchildren on math. Maybe Mr. Leinwand is right; I suggest he is wrong.

But think of it this way. If he is right, Arizona can choose to follow him. If he is wrong, and only Connecticut pursues his radical ideas, then only the children this Connecticut suffer. But if we embrace Bill Clinton's idea, and let us assume it was well-intended, let us assume that my colleagues who were here for the last hour who implored us to adopt a national standard because they think that will help kids, if we follow their lead and if Mr. Leinwand or his colleagues write a national math test which pursues whole math or new math or new new math, the catastrophe to education is not confined to Connecticut; it will spread across America because that national test will set a national standard.

The national test and the national standard will be picked up by the textbooks across America and it will not matter if States voluntarily participate or if the people in Arizona choose not to participate voluntarily, opt out, because the only textbooks they will be able to get will be textbooks that teach that national standard. And that one-size-fits-all national standard which does not teach math computational skills as Mr. Leinwand wants it not to teach it and not to test it, and remember he is not only on the President's committee, but he is also on this National Association of Math Teachers committee which as an association has disavowed teaching basic math skills, we will have a disaster.

The literature here is pretty clear. California has already pursued whole math and it has turned out to be, in

the view of many teachers and parents in California, a disaster. And they have now tried to seize it back, and in many schools, school district by school district they are throwing out the new new math or the whole math and putting back in the basic math.

As a matter of fact in one school district they have forbidden calculators in grades one through three because they want kids to learn the basic skills. But if we pursue a national standard. If the President wins this debate which will occur between the House and the Senate in the conference committee in the next few weeks, we do not have a problem in just Connecticut or just California, we will have a nationwide disaster.

I want to point this out, because this issue is going to go to a conference committee. The Senate has adopted one position on this issue, the House has another position, and the President a third.

The President's position is we should have a national standard written by the Federal Department of Education, a national test written by the Federal Department of Education and if there is a new fad in the Federal Department of Education by the bureaucrats and the ''educrats'' in there, that is fine. Put that fad in the test and we can change that later. It will be hard to change a single Federal standard.

The Senate has taken a middle ground. The Senate's position is let us go ahead and have a national test, but let us pick an independent body to write that national test, that one-size-fits-all national test.

□ 2300

Mr. SOUDER. It is important to note for the record that the independent body is picked two-thirds by the President of the United States.

Mr. SHADEGG. That is scary in and of itself. One of the proposals by the Senate was to give this test writing responsibility to an organization called the National Assessment Governing Board. The idea behind the Senate proposal is we will take it out of the Federal Department of Education, where trends in pop math or popular teaching and writing in the education field is most fervent, and we will put it in a more objective group that is not quite as subject to these trends or fads in education. And the problem with that, Ms. Cheney writes about it in this second article entitled ''Yes to High Standards, No to National Tests,'' a position paper written by Lynne Cheney, senior fellow, American Enterprise Institute, she says the problem with the Senate position is one of naivete; is it assumes that the Federal Department of Education is the only one subject to these national fads in education and that if we just take it away from them and give it to this new organization, the National Assessment Governing Board, that they will protect these national one-size-fits-all tests from fads and trends.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is being very kind. Mrs. Cheney was being very kind as well. The fact is it was a sham compromise to try to get themselves out of a pickle because the nominees, the overwhelming majority of those nominees would be picked by the President, recommended by the Department of Education, so in fact it is the same body. It looks different but if it walks like a duck, talks like a duck and swims like a duck, it is a duck.

Mr. SHADEGG. Is the gentleman suggesting that this might have been just a political charade so it was not publicly vested in the Federal Department of Education, but the reality is that it would be the exact same?

Mr. SOUDER. I was certainly suggesting that the only difference was that there might be a third minority on the one and the other would be all Clinton appointees.

Mr. SHADEGG. For a moment, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the House position is the right position. The House position, the idea of a one-size-fits-all national test is a bad one, and it is not bad because of who writes it. It is bad because of the implications of a single test. Letting parents, teachers, school advocates in my home State write our test I think is the right way to go.

There are already many quote unquote national tests. The Iowa Basic Skills Test was given to my school all the time I was growing up. I think they are still given there now. I would be interested in hearing from the gentleman what is given in Indiana. But it is not as though we cannot compare performance from school to school or State to State.

And indeed, if we want a non-Federal, that is a nongovernment written test that people could voluntarily choose to give to their children, that might have some value. But the problem in this debate and the concern I have is that we are going to surrender, in the spirit of doing good for our children, we are going to surrender the notion that that means we need a single national test.

I heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle tonight say, you cannot care about kids, you cannot support public education, you cannot believe in the process if you do not support national tests. They are wrong. I think every American in their gut that thinks about it knows that they are wrong. We cannot turn education in America over to the latest fad, as embodied either in the Department of Education or in a sham independent group.

That is why I was compelled to come to the floor tonight and talk about this issue, so that the people back home in my district who are just kind of casually thinking about the idea of national standards would think it through one more step and recognize that a national test sets a national standard, and if that national standard is written in Washington, DC, many thousands of miles from my home in Phoenix, AZ, and at least 1,000 miles from your home in Indiana, I think they will recognize they would rather have input at the local level.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to reinforce the gentleman's remarks. I may be even more scared than you because Indiana is only 600 miles away from Washington; therefore, we are even more vulnerable than the people in Arizona.

One of the things that is unusual about this Congress is that we are actually having a discussion about the role of federalism and the role of States and the Federal Government. It has been something that we have been pushing. We are at a critical point here on national testing. As an American history buff, I have gone back and forth and wondered at the time of the founding of our country, would I have been more of an anti-Federalist or a Federalist? Where would I have been on the Articles of Confederation? Would I be like Fisher Ames from New England, who was very skeptical of the Constitution and worried that it was giving up States' rights, or Patrick Henry, another hero of mine, ''Give me liberty or give me death,'' when he heard about the Articles of Confederation moving into the Constitution? He said, ''I smell a rat.'' He was worried that the Constitution was going to be abused the way it is being abused today.

I on the other hand, as a business major and a business person, I want to reiterate one other thing that the gentleman from Arizona said. I attended public elementary school, junior high and high school. My wife did the same. All three of my children have done the same. We Republicans care deeply about public education. That is why we are so concerned about these national tests. As we get into this debate, and as a business major and a businessman, I have deep concerns about the quality of education graduates.

A book that had a big impact on me was ''Cultural Literacy'' by Hirsch, and in that book he suggests that we are in danger in America of a vulcanization, the root word that comes over what we are seeing in Bosnia and Croatia right now, that is, overlapping groups of people who cannot communicate with each other. We are in danger of that in America.

We need some commonality of language, some commonality of history. We need high school graduates who can read and write and do basic math. We need people who have the skills with which to come into industry. We are already near the point where private industry has as many teachers as the public schools, because they are so upset about the quality of education. It is not hard to understand what is driving the desire for standards among businessmen and among many people in this country. We need to have standards.

The question is, whose standards? Even though I, as somebody who has certain tendencies, the gentleman from

Arizona and I, who are good friends, often will debate what is the proper role of the Federal Government and State governments. And at times I tend to be a little more proactive in the area of the Federal Government than the gentleman from Arizona. We have had some interesting evenings debating this. But nobody who understands the founding of our Republic and who understands the evolution of our Republic believes that education was intended to be a Federal role.

One of the things that we need to understand up here is to understand why our Founding Fathers were concerned about certain matters falling into the hands of the Federal Government. We have heard the appalling cases that the gentleman from Arizona brought out in math. You would think that math would be relatively noncontroversial. We already saw what happened with history standards.

Mr. SHADEGG. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, for just one moment, we really did get into this debate because there was an earlier debate where the advocates of national tests said, we will just do national tests. They never pointed out there are subjective areas where what you teach can vary rather dramatically. If you teach American history, you can have one view of it or another, and they can be radically different.

So the President and others responded and said, we will not do subject areas like social studies or history. We will do the black and white, there is a right answer, there is a wrong answer, like math and science. And on the floor of the House here, in his State of the Union, the President proposed only to test math and science.

I think the gentleman from Indiana is about to point out some of the outrageous things that are going on in the other areas. I just want to point out, even when you go to so-called objective subject areas like math and science, you discover that there are these radical trends which say two plus two is not four or you should not teach kids 6 times 7 is 42. And even what we think of as objective in the crazy world of the education bureaucracy has become itself subjective.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman has pointed out is absolutely correct. You have devastated our hardest argument to make, which is that math even is politicized in this day and age, and can be ineffective if consolidated with power in the hands of the wrong people.

I want to hasten to point out, for those who say, but if the Federal Government makes a mistake, they can change it, this national testing is moving forward. Inside the Department of Education, as they prepared the tests without any authorization from Congress, without any appropriations from Congress, in fact with over two-thirds of this House of Representatives going on record against national testing, it still is moving forward. If they passed a bad test and we wanted to try to amend that test, even in most cases, if we could get two-thirds in the House to override, the Senate would block us and certainly the President would veto it and we would have a filibuster in the Senate.

In other words, once it is bad, it will probably not get corrected.

Now, the problem here is that there is a history, so to speak, with this. Lynne Cheney, who we have quoted a number of times tonight, actually was in the humanities art department of the Federal Government and now admits that she made the mistake of granting the first funds for the history exams. She says, ''I was wrong.'' She watched the bias that crept into the history. She has written also how every category in our universities, and do we want to spread this to our high schools, has become politicized.

College Art Association conference warning faculty members not to teach women artists such as Mary Cassatt, who has beautiful oil paintings over in our national art museums, because they frequently painted women and children and thus reinforced patriarchal thought. At the University of Wisconsin, a professor from the University of Wisconsin writing in the Harvard Educational Review, the most prestigious university in our country, at least arguably, urges her fellow professors to be open about their intention to appropriate public resources, classrooms, school supplies, teacher-professor salaries, academic requirements and degrees to further, quote, progressive agendas. Curriculum and instruction 607, in which students learn how to conduct political demonstrations and then conduct these political demonstrations in the library, mall and administrative offices of the university; for these efforts, students receive three hours credit.

In a recent issue of College English, a publication of the National Council of Teachers of English, a professor from California advises university teachers to vary the political strategy they use in the classroom to suit the institution. For example, he says, in his middle class university he tries to show how the United States offers freedom of choice and a chance to get ahead and then challenges their belief in that. Then he shows them in his English class the odds against their attaining room at the top, the way their education has channeled them towards a mid-level professional and social slot and conditioned them into authoritarian conformity in English class.

Then we have the Smithsonian museum in the United States which has been under attack for how they present the American West. They have been under attack for how they tried to rewrite the Japanese American section of World War II and had to have Congress intervene. They said, in an exhibition called Etiquette of the Underclass, they wrote, ''Upward mobility,'' announced materials accompanying the exhibition, ''is one of our most cherished myths.''

Now, what we are seeing is the National Council of English, we are seeing the Harvard Education Review, the College Art Association, we are seeing the Smithsonian institution, all politicizing major statements in the United States.

My concern spreads past this. I read earlier this evening, and I wanted to go through this again, at Casa Roble High School into Sacramento, California, this was a values appraisal scale in a career study in a technology class. This was given to a student. It was given to me last Thursday. It is not something that was done 10 years ago. It was done August 29, 1997. It was not something that is far out. It has been done now, we found it in five States. It appears to be possibly the National Education Association that is circulating this. It is incredibly intrusive.

On the one hand these questions can be innocuous and you can see how they might be valuable to a guidance counselor. On the other hand, think of the dangers of an all-powerful Federal Government getting this kind of information on our children.

Mr. SHADEGG. I just want to clarify, you are going to read to us from a survey given to students at a public school, not a religious or private or sectarian school, and administered by the school asking these questions of public school students; is that right?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, in a technology class. The reason I want to point this out is this is what we do not want to have happen in a Federal test. If it happens in a Federal test, we will never get it changed. Question number one starts off, ''I have a regular physical checkup by my doctor every year.''

Mr. SHADEGG. These questions are put to the student who answers this?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, and you can have a 10 for definitely true, 7 for mostly true, 5 for undecided, mostly false is a 3, definitely false is a zero.

Mr. SHADEGG. They would be revealing this information, answering these questions about themselves to be handed over to the school and for the school to use for whatever purpose they chose?

Mr. SOUDER. For technology class, and it is a career study. It is to help channel kids as to what they should do. Think of this explosive information. Is this what we want public authorities knowing about our families? And if you do not think this is one of the most intrusive things you have ever heard, then perhaps you are on a different planet than I am.

Number two, ''I will regularly take my children to church services.'' So they are asking these children in high school to anticipate whether they are going to take their children to church services. ''I have a close relationship with either my mother or my father.'' You will see patterns to a number of questions I am reading. Half of them are family intrusive and half of them

are religious intrusive. ''I have taught Sunday school class or otherwise taken an active part in my church,'' if that is any business of the school.

□ 2315

Number 24, I believe in a God who answers prayers. I believe that tithing, giving one-tenth of one's earnings to the church, is one's duty to God. Number 41, I pray to God about my problems. Number 43, I like to spend holidays with my family. Number 53, it is important that grace be said before meals. Number 59, I care what my parents think about the things I do. Number 63, I believe there is life after death. Number 72, I read the bible and other religious writings regularly. Number 78, I love my parents. Number 82, I believe that God created man in his own image. Number 91, if I ask God for forgiveness, my sins are forgiven. Number 95, I respect my father and mother.

EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REDMOND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to finish this point, because in my kids' own high school in Indiana, a survey was passed out in class through the high school yearbook that led me to get upset in my first term, and we passed some legislation here, but it concerned questions asked about anal sex, among other things, and it was one of the most offensive surveys I have ever read, even worse than this, even though this is probing even deeper into religious beliefs. But in Indiana the school board responded. They changed the rules of the school and they took back the test.

The parent of the child who was in this class is taking it up with her school board and it can have an impact. When something happens in our local schools, we can try to do something about it and try to affect change. But when something happens in Washington, we are virtually powerless to change that. I say that as a United States Congressman. We are virtually powerless. It is very frustrating.

And if we let Washington take over the national testing, it is a frightening scenario ahead.

Mr. SHADEGG. If the gentleman will yield, I just want to conclude what we talked about the last hour. I applaud the gentleman for going into those other areas and pointing out that it is not just the one example that I chose of math, which is what the President is proposing, math and science, but indeed in other areas it goes into far more subjective subjects, far more invasive and intrusive questions, but importantly, as the gentleman pointed out, those invasions, those abuses, those trends occur at the States level where we have a chance to deal with them.

I just want to conclude this hour, or the hour and now 5 minutes we picked up, by saying I hope that our colleagues listening realize that it is not that we do not care about the education of our children. I know the gentleman has young children both in high school, grade school and in college, I guess, and I have mentioned earlier in the hour I have young children. I care very much about their education. And as I said, I resent it when the other side says Republicans do not care about education or Republicans do not care about public education. I care deeply about public education. And as I said, I went all the way through public education myself and both my children are in public education.

I hope that those listening understand that we can deeply believe in education, we can deeply believe in public education, and we can be very concerned and very, very much opposed to national testing, a sound-good motherhood and apple pie idea, because of the dangerous consequences.

What the gentleman said is exactly right. If we have tests written in Fort Wayne, Indiana, or in Phoenix, Arizona, or wherever it might be, we can deal with the problems that might creep into those. But if they are written in Washington, D.C., in a mindless bureaucracy which is hard to penetrate and where, quite frankly, only the views of the most deeply imbedded, entrenched educational bureaucracy are heard, I think we will lose control of our kids' education.

I do want to point out that this is a critical issue; that it is in a conference report. There are members in the United States Senate mentioned in Lynne Cheney's article who are fighting against the Senate position on this issue, who agree with us that as good sounding as national testing is, it is, in fact, bad for education in America. And I would urge our colleagues to talk with their friends on the other side and try to get them to accede to the House position on this issue and let us study this issue further and make sure we do not write a national test.

I also want to point out that having read Lynne Cheney's column, which mentioned Steven Leinwand, I wanted to find his actual article. I have the actual article and it does in fact say it is time to acknowledge that continuing to teach pencil and paper computational algorithms to our students is not only unnecessary but counterproductive and dangerous.

He goes on to say that learning long division and its computational cousins, meaning subtraction and multiplication, is an obsolete notion.

These are rather shocking notions that are written here. I also wanted to point out that several times in my remarks I talked about mathematics association with which Mr. Leinwand is associated and it is called the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and they have already written a national assessment which has reduced the math portion of the exam where we do computational skills by 20 percent already.

These are not us talking about crazy ideas that some individual extreme person has. These are trendy ideas that are catching on across America and could be dangerous if they in fact take hold and are embodied into a single national test.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for bringing the attention of this country to the math standards.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHIFF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today through October 24, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. POMBO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. GREENWOOD (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of waiting in hospital with his family while his father has triple bypass surgery.

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. FALEOMAVAEGA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes each day, on October 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. BILBRAY, for 5 minutes, on October 8.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on October 7.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, on October 7.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, on October 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, 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. FALEOMAVAEGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. VISCLOSKY.

Mr. SHERMAN.

Mr. KIND.

Mr. LEVIN.