

NEWS RELEASE

from Texas Christian Coalition
and Bexar County Christian Coalition

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: June 2, 1995

CONTACT: Shirley Thompson
Spokesperson
(210) 680-5569

Repeal Goals 2000, Return Education Control To Parents and Local Communities

SAN ANTONIO - Shirley Thompson, spokesperson for Christian Coalition said, "Goals 2000 is the educational version of The Great Society. We don't need a new "edufare" system. We need to get parents involved and return education to the control of states and local communities."

The Department of Education, created in 1980, now consists of 241 separate programs, more than 5,000 employees, and a budget of \$30 billion.

The U.S. currently spends approximately \$275 billion per year on public education. But 10 nations, including Hungary, Taiwan and the former Soviet Union, outperform our 13-year-olds in math and science. Less than half of federal education dollars reach classrooms for instruction. Additionally, scores on the SAT have dropped 75 points since 1960.

The need for education reform is obvious. But how does the federal government respond to this need? By creating more federal programs. Goals 2000, consisting of the Educate America Act and the Improving America's School Act, which re-authorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). These Acts represent the "educrats solution" to the problem.

In addition to establishing several new federal bureaucracies, Goals 2000 authorizes the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC). This council has the authority to certify national education standards regarding content and student performance. The standards are not mandatory but states must "voluntarily" develop comparable standards in order to receive a portion of the funds authorized under the ESEA.

\$2.2 million in federal funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the U.S. Department of Education were spent to develop the national history standards. If These standards are an indication of what we can expect, get ready for more drops in scores and performance. Standards developed for United states History and World History were so biased and distorted that the United States Senate overwhelmingly adopted (99 to 1) a resolution condemning the standards and expressing the sense of the Senate that NESIC not certify them.

Thompson said, "The first step toward "meaningful" reform will be repealing Goals 2000 followed by eliminating the Department of Education."

###

Texas Family Research Center

Contact:
Anne Newman, Director
210-/681-4311

Hold until 9:30 a.m. June 2, 1995

Goals 2000 not family-friendly

Press Statement

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act requires states to develop an improvement plan that includes strategies for "parental and community support and involvement." There are two things wrong with the role that Goals 2000 has in mind for parents:

1. **The "Government Village" concept:** Connecting children and their parents to government services is federal government's idea of parental involvement. This legislation calls for changing the purpose of schools from education to **"one-stop shopping"** centers of social, welfare, and health services, including school-based health clinics.
2. **Parental Rights:** This legislation fails to protect parental rights in the most sensitive area: contraceptive distribution, rather it calls for "parental participation" to "the extent practical" regarding giving condoms and pills to minors.

The "one-stop shopping" concept comes from the idea that "it takes a village to raise a child." It sets the stage for the creation of a financially and psychologically dependent people who are upon government. "It doesn't take a costly, government-created village to raise a child; it takes a family to raise a child," said Anne Newman, Director, Texas Family Research Center.

"One-stop shopping" is defined by the Texas Education Agency as "services delivered through a single point of entry, access or referral. For example, families may receive a **single identification card** which provides access to food stamps, health services, school nutrition programs, transportation services, child care, and counseling services." [emphasis added]¹ This sets the stage for a Big-Brother tracking system and Big-Mother government. A key component of "one-stop shopping" is health services — this is Joycelyn Elders' school-based clinics repackaged and marketed under "education reform."

Other concerns also raise "red flags," including:

- There is no free-money. Federal money comes with federal strings.
- At this time, Texas is on a "fast track" to get its state "improvement plan" submitted to the Department of Education. Public hearings are being held, but the parents whose children and schools will be affected have little or no knowledge of the hearings or the process.
- Goals 2000 has been controversial across the nation. Concerns include everything from the controversial national history standards to Outcome-Based Education.

I urge parents to heed these and other red warning flags that have caused Montana and Virginia to reject Goals 2000.

¹ Family and Community Support: Coordinated Health and Human Services, The Commissioner's Critical Analysis, TEA

Goals 2000 Facts

1. Goals 2000, passed by Congress in March 1994, established a new federal level of bureaucracy, which will act as an un-elected national school board:

- The National Education Goals Panel
- National Education Standards and Improvement Council (House voted to abolish)
- National Skills Standards Board

2. States that receive Goals 2000 funds must develop a state improvement plan that includes:

- A process for developing state content standards, student performance standards, and assessment standards. (p.40)
- A process for aligning state or local curricula, instructional materials and State assessments" with standards. (p.40-41)
- A process for "developing, selecting or recommending instructional materials, including gender equitable and multicultural materials." (p.41) Congressman Dick Armey has said this will result in "politically correct" textbooks and curriculum.
- A process for training teachers to provide instruction consistent with the standards. (p.41-42)

3. The Goals 2000: Educate America Act requires states to submit an improvement plan to the U.S. Department of Education for approval. The "plan" must include strategies for "parental and community support and involvement," such as:

"increasing the access of all students to social services, health care, nutrition, related services, and child care services and locating such services in schools, cooperating with service agencies, community-based centers, or other convenient sites to designed to provide 'one-stop shopping' for parents and students." (Sec. 306, pg. 42)

4. Texas is on a Goals 2000 "fast track" to get approved as a demonstration state.

5. Goals 2000 does not protect parental rights to consent in regards to contraception; rather,

it weakly supports parental participation "to the extent practical."

The Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education shall ensure that all federally funded programs which provide for the distribution of contraceptive devices to unemancipated minors develop procedures to encourage, to the extent practical, family participation in such programs. (Sec 1018, p. 151)

6. Local school districts that receive Goals 2000 funding must also develop an improvement plan, which must:

"describe how the local education agency will implement specific programs aimed at ensuring improvements in school readiness and the ability of students to learn effectively at all grade levels by identifying the most pressing needs facing students and their families with regard to social services, health care, nutrition, and child care, and entering into partnerships with public and private nonprofit agencies to increase the access of students and families to coordinated nonsectarian services in a school setting or at a nearby site." (p. 46)

Since problems related to teen pregnancy are frequently identified as pressing needs, this is a license to enter into a partnership with service providers such as Planned Parenthood. At a public hearing in July 1994, Planned Parenthood urged the State Board of Education to participate in Goals 2000.

7. Congress has passed legislation to abolish the national standards council. At least one reason for this is the controversial national history standards — see "The End of History" by Lynne V. Cheney, *Wall Street Journal*, October 20, 1994. Gary Bauer, President of the Family Research Council in Washington, DC, said "If we adopt these amnesiac history standards, we will succumb to a kind of national identity crisis. We will cease to remember who we are and why it matters that there is an America."

What Others Say about Goals 2000

"A vote for Goals 2000 is a vote for a federal takeover of America's neighborhood schools."

— Texas Congressman Dick Armey

"I oppose Goals 2000 because it attaches a number of 'strings' to the grant money it offers. These strings are de facto mandates on states and they are harmful."

— William Bennett, March 2, 1995

Former Secretary of Education

"I would treat it about the same way you would treat a fox dressed as a duck at a duck-family reunion."

— Lamar Alexander

Former Secretary of Education

"How should parents respond to this latest government power grab? Just as they would if they knew their children's school was on fire — they should get them out fast."

— Cal Thomas, *L.A. Times Syndicate*, April 1994

"...I am a strong advocate of restoring local control to our local schools, I believe that Goals 2000 works against that purpose ... I opposed this legislation when it passed the Senate during the 103rd Congress and do not support it now."

— United States Senator Phil Gramm

"National Goals 2000 stresses the 'whole child' approach, addressing the personal, social, emotional, and academic needs of the child."

— Texas School Counselors Association

Testimony at the State Board of Education July 1994

"I am here on behalf of Planned Parenthood of Austin to express my support for Goals 2000 legislation."

— Mary Reed

Testimony at the State Board of Education July 1994

"I support the Goals 2000 in total, as does the membership of the Texas Family Planning Association."

— Peggy Romberg, Texas Family Planning Association

Testimony at the State Board of Education July 1994

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT: RESPONDING TO KEY FACTUAL ERRORS AND ASSERTIONS IN THE HERITAGE FOUNDATION BRIEF FOR CONGRESS

This document responds to many of the factual errors and assertions contained in the Heritage Foundation briefing paper on education for members of Congress. It is intended to set the record straight by correcting the mistakes.

CORRECTING FACTUAL ERRORS

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act

Error: Goals 2000 turns "the 1989 standards approved by President Bush and the nation's governors into law."

Correction: President Bush and the nation's governors, led by Governors Terry Branstad, Carroll Campbell, and then-Governor Bill Clinton, did not approve any standards in 1989. They approved the creation of six National Education Goals.

Error: "Under Goals 2000, three new federal bureaucracies are created."

Correction: The Goals 2000 Act establishes three independent boards, each of which is comprised of nonfederal employees—state and local officials, business leaders, parents, and educators, serving in volunteer positions and supported by a total staff of less than 30 people and a budget of less than \$10 million. One of the boards, the National Education Goals Panel, already existed.

Error: "The National Education Goals Panel has already started to develop standards for states."

Correction: The National Education Goals Panel is not developing standards for the states, nor does it have the authority to create standards or to prescribe the use of any standards by a state, school district, or school. The National Education Goals Panel was established by President Bush as a result of the President's education summit with the nation's Governors. This independent, bipartisan panel has 18 members, nine Democrats and nine Republicans. Of the eight governors who are members, five of them (Arne Carson of Minnesota, Jim Edgar of Illinois, John Engler of Michigan, Daniel Fordice of Mississippi, and Christine Whitman of New Jersey) are Republicans. The Goals Panel's primary purpose is to measure the nation's

and states' progress toward the National Education Goals and to highlight successful community and state efforts to improve student performance.

Error: Goals 2000 adds two national goals that "deviate from the original intentions of the states and venture into top-down federal 'input' regulation and process-oriented, rather than results-oriented, goals."

Correction: The Goals 2000 legislation passed with bipartisan support in both houses. It legislatively created eight National Education Goals. The two additional goals are having well prepared teachers and promoting parents' involvement in supporting their children's learning. (The Parent-Teachers Association and other supporters of parental involvement in education advocated the inclusion of the latter goal.) The U.S. Department of Education does not issue any regulations in regard to the National Education Goals.

Error: "The panels setting up the standards are politically controlled and already have created 'politically correct' standards that distort American history."

Correction: It is simply wrong to say that the nationally-recognized groups, such as the National Academy of Sciences, the National Geographic Society, and professional associations, that are developing voluntary standards in various disciplines have exerted political control over standards. The standards-setting groups have sought broad input of teachers, parents, and members of the wider community. They have stimulated a public conversation about what Americans expect their children to know and be able to do.

Neither the National Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC) nor the National Education Goals Panel has a role in developing standards. All of the federally-supported standard setting projects were selected and funded during the Bush administration. For example, Lamar Alexander, then Secretary of Education, and Lynne Cheney, former head of the National Endowment for the Humanities, selected and funded the National Center for the Study of History in Schools at UCLA to develop history standards. The development of the standards was a several year process that involved hundreds of teachers, local educators, and professionals in the field. People who have concerns about any of the emerging standards should direct them to the groups developing them.

Error: NESIC "will essentially serve as a 19-member national school board. All members will be politically appointed by the President."

Correction: NESIC will not be a national school board. It will have no authority with regard to the operation of state and local education. It will have no authority with regard to federal funding or regulations. The authority of NESIC is to discuss, review, and, if appropriate, certify content and performance standards that are submitted to NESIC. It will also discuss, review, and, if appropriate, certify opportunity-to-learn standards that are submitted. No group or state is required to submit standards to NESIC and no federal funding is tied to having standards certified by NESIC. The members of NESIC will be appointed by the President from among individuals nominated by Senate and House leadership in Congress and the Secretary of Education in accordance with the requirements of the law. The individuals appointed to NESIC are to be equally divided between the two political parties.

Error: NESIC "will approve or disapprove all state-developed plans to meet the national education goals set by the Education Goals Panel."

Correction: NESIC will not review, approve or disapprove any plans developed by states, local communities, or schools for any federal programs.

Error: The legislation "developed 'opportunity-to-learn' standards" that "specify the level of 'inputs' schools must reach in order to receive federal funding."

Correction: The Goals 2000 Act does not develop or specify opportunity-to-learn standards. The legislation does provide resources for coalitions of educators, state and local officials, and concerned citizens to develop voluntary national standards, and authorizes funds for the development of standards at the state level. While states participating in Goals 2000 are required to describe standards or strategies for providing all students with an opportunity to learn, the standards or strategies are intended to serve as a guide and their implementation is voluntary.

NESIC has the responsibility to discuss, review, and, if appropriate, certify voluntary opportunity-to-learn standards that may be submitted to it.

The Improving America's Schools Act (IASA)

Error: "To qualify for federal funds, each state must submit a plan for approval by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council."

Correction: This is absolutely false. No state is required to submit a plan to NESIC in order to receive federal funds under the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA). States are not required to submit anything to NESIC to receive federal funds under IASA.

Error: "The independent National Assessment Governing Board will lose its independence. In the past, a nonpartisan board elected new members as individual terms expired."

Correction: This is incorrect. In the past, the Secretary of Education appointed individuals to the National Assessment Governing Board from a list of individuals recommended by the National Assessment Governing Board. Under IASA, the Secretary will receive nominations from a wide range of organizations, including governors, state legislators, state boards of education, local boards of education, and others. The opening up of the nomination process to many groups will ensure that the National Assessment Governing Board continues to represent the perspectives of a variety of stakeholder groups and does not become a self-perpetuating body.

Error: IASA contains "a huge windfall . . . for colleges of education, which will receive hundreds of millions of dollars in new 'professional development' funds under the newly overhauled Eisenhower" Professional Development program.

Correction: Not only is this incorrect, it is the reverse of the true situation. The percentage of Eisenhower funds allocated to institutions of higher education was reduced from 25 percent to 16 percent under the new legislation. In fact, in 1994, before IASA passed, institutions of higher education received more Eisenhower funds than they will receive in 1995 under the new Act.

ADDRESSING FLAWED POLICY POSITIONS

The Role of the U.S. Department of Education

Assertion: With regard to the U.S. Department of Education, Congress should "close the Department"; its functions should be "reassigned within the federal government," "transferred to the states," or "eliminated."

Response: The U.S. Department of Education gives education national visibility, bringing cabinet-level attention to an issue that most Americans agree is a critical national priority. (A 1992 Harris poll found that 95 percent of the public believes it is urgent that the United States adopt school reforms to make the nation more competitive.) The Department focuses on critical areas that are of national concern, promoting improvements in elementary and secondary schools (e.g., basic skills, safety, higher standards, improved teaching, better use of technology, parent involvement, school-to-work transitions), and helping all students to have access to high-quality education.

The U.S. Department of Education:

- helps make postsecondary education affordable to middle- and low-income students.
- serves as a supportive partner to states and local communities in their efforts to set challenging standards, bring about effective educational change, and provide support for disadvantaged students and schools.
- assists in the development and dissemination of the best knowledge and ideas about improving education.

Without a federal presence in education:

- at least 6.5 million middle- and low-income students would have difficulty paying for college.
- almost 6 million disadvantaged elementary and secondary school students would not receive the extra services they need to improve their achievement and reach challenging standards.
- states and districts would not receive assistance to fulfill their constitutional obligations to educate 5 million children and youth with disabilities, to help them succeed at the elementary and secondary level and pursue postsecondary education and productive employment.

- about 4 million adults annually would go without the adult basic education and literacy programs they need to be more productive and successful.

The Department carries out its mission efficiently with a very lean administrative staff; in fact, the Department currently employs less than 5,000 staff, one-third less than the 7,700 employed by the former Office of Education and related agencies in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). Over the same period that its staff decreased, its budget increased by 30 percent in real terms. Only 2 cents of every Department dollar goes toward administration. Indeed, the Department is more efficient, less bureaucratic, and more responsive to local concerns than the former Office of Education could possibly be in the large bureaucracy of HEW. The Secretary of Education is immediately accessible to the public and is able to concentrate on critical matters in education, especially the leadership role of focusing national attention on problems and opportunities for reform.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act

Assertion: Congress should "repeal most provisions of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act" and instead "simply grant money to the states for education reform efforts. Congress should then reduce this funding over time as state reform experiments are completed."

Response: Many parent organizations, business groups, and educational organizations representing states and local communities endorsed and supported the passage of the Goals 2000 Act. It supports their efforts to set challenging standards that will strengthen education in their states—teaching, curriculum, and testing aligned with the higher standards. The Goals 2000 Act provides support for effective change. It creates a partnership with states and local school systems to help our students achieve the high standards they will need if they are to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

The Goals 2000 legislation incorporates the best features of an accountable block grant—providing unprecedented flexibility in how funds are spent in exchange for states and districts setting higher standards for results.

Goals 2000 Act requirements are minimal and focus on achieving better results for students. In addition, the legislation authorizes states, local districts, and schools to apply for waivers of requirements in elementary and secondary programs, when regulations hinder reform efforts. Moreover, the Department is issuing no regulations for the Goals 2000 Act.

As for reducing funding over time, Goals 2000 Act funding is intended as a catalyst to assist state efforts in getting reforms off the ground and to stimulate improvement systemwide. While some states are on the leading edge of reform, others have yet to begin. Funds will supplement state and local efforts, not finance them in their entirety.

The Administration believes that simply giving money to states without clear goals or accountability is a poor use of the taxpayers' money.

Assertion: Congress should repeal "all of the regulations and mandates" in Goals 2000.

Response: The Goals 2000 Act contains no mandates and no federal takeovers. In fact, it explicitly prohibits federal control of curriculum, instruction, or allocation of resources. The Department is issuing no regulations for the Goals 2000 Act. Although participation is purely voluntary, over 40 states and territories are already participating.

The Department has stressed state and local flexibility as it has begun to implement the law. The state application form is just 4 pages long. The Department solicited public comment from over 600 persons on the guidance for state plans to be certain that our guidance will help states with their plans, not inhibit them.

Assertion: Congress should "repeal the . . . opportunity-to-learn standards" in Goals 2000.

Response: The Goals 2000 Act does not mandate specific opportunity-to-learn standards, but provides resources to support the development of model standards and strategies at the state and national levels. The Act does encourage states to consider the implementation of standards and strategies for increasing learning opportunities to achieve high academic standards for students. States participating in Goals 2000 will develop their own opportunity-to-learn standards or strategies that they deem appropriate to ensure that all students receive a fair opportunity to be exposed to the enriching curriculum and challenging instruction needed to reach high standards. They may also draw upon voluntary national opportunity-to-learn standards to be developed by coalitions of state and local officials, educators, parents, students, and business leaders funded under Goals 2000. States will not lose federal funds if they choose not to use the voluntary national standards, and the U.S. Department of Education will not review or comment on or condition any resources on any opportunity-to-learn standards developed by the states.

Assertion: Congress should repeal "the 7th and 8th goals that were not agreed to by the governors. These latter goals regulate 'inputs.' The others deal with performance measures."

Response: Congress, with bipartisan support in both houses, passed the eight National Education Goals, and these goals were endorsed by almost every major business, educator, and parent organization that is involved in education at the state and local level; the Parent-Teacher Association was a major proponent of the goal to increase parental involvement in education. The Department believes that greater family involvement and improved professional development are key components of reform, essential to attaining all the other goals. They are necessary conditions for students to reach challenging standards, just as are other goals such as maintaining a safe and drug-free environment and ensuring that young children are ready for school. Three decades of research have shown that parent involvement can make a significant difference in student achievement. Teachers who know

the subject matter and can incorporate challenging standards in instruction are equally important to achieving our national goals.

Assertion: Congress should "eliminate the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC), the National Goals Panel, and the National Skills Board."

Response: The National Education Goals Panel's primary purpose is to measure the nation's and states' progress toward meeting the National Education Goals and to highlight successful community and state efforts to improve education. NESIC and the National Skill Standards Board are responsible for reviewing and discussing standards that states and organizations may submit to them for national certification, if appropriate.

Just as participation in Goals 2000 itself is voluntary, states that do participate are free to work with these three nonfederal bodies or to completely ignore them—without jeopardizing their Goals 2000 funding, or any other federal funding. The National Education Goals Panel, predating the Goals 2000 Act, provides the nation with annual reporting on our progress in reaching the goals and maintaining the focus on improvement. Elimination of the National Education Goals Panel would leave national reporting to federal officials.

Assertion: Congress should "eliminate the bureaucratic state application process in the Act, replacing it with a simple requirement that the states send in a letter saying how they spent the Goals 2000 money within the terms of the Act."

Response: First, the application process is minimal. The Goals 2000 state application form is just 4 pages long, asking only 4 questions, and it is processed quickly. The application asks states to describe how they will go about developing or enhancing their own approach to education reform with the additional federal funds. Subsequent reporting is limited to describing the results that have been achieved in setting standards and improving student performance, not how the money was spent. Of the 41 states and 9 territories that have applied, 40 states and 4 territories have been funded.

Second, the proposed letter explaining how funds were used would focus exclusively on inputs, not on progress toward achieving more challenging standards for student performance. It would lead to tracking of funds and rigid procedural compliance, violating the basic tenets of the new legislation.

**The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)/
The Improving America's Schools Act (IASA)**

Assertion: Congress should "repeal all social service programs. Schools should go back to teaching and educating students instead of serving as social service agencies." Congress should "remove the requirement that states send plans to the federal government on . . . social services," including "how districts will coordinate health screenings and services."

Response: Removing state and local authority to coordinate education with social services grossly restricts their ability to decide on the best uses of resources to address the needs of their students. Provisions in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) encourage greater flexibility in enabling state and local educational agencies to work collaboratively with other agencies serving students.

Schools and teachers have to deal with the educational problems that result when students' social service needs are not met. Rather than interfering with education, school-based and school-linked social service programs can give educators a place to turn when they are confronted with student needs that they cannot, and should not be expected to, meet.

Similarly, coordinated planning will assist schools in concentrating on their primary mission of education, by allowing them to place responsibility for addressing social service needs with appropriate programs and agencies instead of spreading their own resources thin trying to duplicate existing services.

Assertion: Congress should "alter the formula for granting Chapter 1 money. Funds should go to poor students, as originally intended, not to students in the districts of powerful Members of Congress."

Response: The Department agrees that Title I targeting needs to be focused on high-poverty areas, and it sought greater targeting in its proposal to Congress. The Department's formula proposal would have targeted more funding on the nation's poorest school districts. While it did not achieve the degree of targeting sought, the Department believes that the Title I formula enacted by Congress, once fully phased in, will make some strides towards better targeting of resources. In particular, the new Targeted Grants formula gives greater weight and funding to counties and districts with greater numbers and concentrations of poor children.

Assertion: Congress should "add an effective federal charter schools program that maintains state and local flexibility and encourages state charter school reforms."

Response: There are federal charter schools provisions contained in IASA and the Goals 2000: Educate America Act that maintain state and local flexibility and encourage charter school reforms. IASA will support the creation of innovative charter schools in states where this is authorized by state legislatures. The Goals 2000 Act invites state and community leaders to make effective changes in their education systems; this obviously could include charter schools. Public charter schools can be an innovation for improving school and student performance, replacing rules-based governance with goals-based accountability.

Specifically, the federal program authorizes grants for charter schools to create challenging curricula, involve teachers in developing distinctive programs, and reach out to parents and the community. Public charter schools will be released from most regulatory requirements in exchange for developing and implementing a plan to achieve better results in student learning.

Assertion: When Congress revises the statute, it should "preserve state and local authority over standards for curriculum content and student performance and state and local authority over student assessment, including how testing results are used by the states and localities. Congress also should protect state and local authority over the resources that states and communities spend on education and over school and classroom practices."

Response: The federal government exercises no control over the resources that states and communities spend on education or over school and classroom practices. Indeed, the new legislation recognizes that if federal programs are to be effective they must work in tandem with state and local reform efforts. The legislation responds to concern that compliance with the rules and regulations surrounding federal education programs has often constrained the flexibility necessary to achieve improvement. For example, the reliance on nationally-normed testing in Title I often limited state testing, and consequently instruction. The new Title I allows states to use their own state assessments that measure performance in attaining the skills and standards they deem to be important.

New waiver authority provides states, districts, and schools with unprecedented opportunity to operate federal programs with maximum

flexibility, when they can show that rules and regulations hinder their reform efforts.

The new legislation shifts the emphasis of Title I accountability away from compliance with rules and tracking resources towards a results-based system founded on assessments of student learning linked to state content and performance standards. Expansion of the Title I schoolwide option will allow schools to use Title I funds to strengthen teaching and learning for all children in a school; it also permits schools to combine federal resources to create comprehensive strategies for improving teaching and learning and get better results.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Assertion: Congress should "repeal the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). IDEA is extremely expensive and redundant in light of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). It creates legal nightmares and provides few educational benefits. IDEA is a huge federal mandate which is costing the states billions of dollars. Congress . . . pays only 8 percent" of IDEA costs. "Yet officials still have every incentive to declare as many children 'disabled' as possible in their area so that they can collect additional funding."

Response: The right of children with disabilities to a free, appropriate, public education is grounded in the United States Constitution. Prior to the enactment of IDEA, one million children with disabilities were excluded entirely from public schools. Landmark federal court cases decided before the enactment of IDEA established that the responsibility of states and local school districts to educate individuals with disabilities is derived from the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. The drafting of IDEA was guided by the principles of these court decisions and a recognition of the federal role in ensuring that all children with disabilities in the nation be provided the equal opportunity that the Constitution guarantees. IDEA articulates for the states a minimum floor of responsibility based on the Constitution.

The federal government plays a particularly important role in assisting the states in meeting their constitutional obligation to ensure the education of children with disabilities. In addition to safeguarding the rights of children with disabilities and their parents, the federal government supports state efforts through fiscal aid to states and through development of the knowledge and practices necessary to ensure a free, appropriate education under IDEA.

In the past twenty years, results for children with disabilities have improved dramatically. Today, one of the basic goals of the law—ensuring that children with disabilities are not excluded from school—has been largely achieved. Graduation rates are higher. More students are going on to college. Today, 56.8 percent of youth with disabilities are competitively employed within five years of leaving school. These educational improvements have saved tax money and allowed our society to benefit from the talents and productivity of people with disabilities.

Of course, we are concerned about federal requirements that impose unnecessary burdens or that divert resources from the teaching and learning of students. Major portions of IDEA will be reviewed by Congress this year. This review is an opportunity to review a good law and improve and

strengthen it based on 20 years of experience and implementation. The Department is reexamining IDEA based on the following principles:

- (1) Enable students with disabilities to benefit from state and local reform efforts by aligning IDEA with those efforts.
- (2) Promote high expectations for students with disabilities.
- (3) Address individual student needs in the least restrictive environment.
- (4) Ensure that those who are closest to students—families, teachers, and principals—have the knowledge and training they need to work effectively with students and with each other.
- (5) Focus on teaching and learning to enable states, districts, and schools to use resources more effectively.

The bottom line will be improving results for students with disabilities, reducing unnecessary burdens for educators and families, and ensuring that all the incentives in the law are aligned to strengthen the capacity of schools to help students with disabilities reach higher standards.

The Federal Direct Loan Program

Assertion: Congress should "eliminate the new direct education lending program" because under the Federal Direct Loan Program, "the taxpayer bears all the risk. Schools and students should bear greater responsibilities," so Congress should create a "school-financed loan loss reserve fund" because "taxpayers would save a significant portion of the funds which now pay for default claims."

Response: Default risk is covered in approximately the same way in both the Federal Direct Loan and the Guaranteed Student Loan Program (in other words, the risk to taxpayers is similar in both programs). While a school-financed loan loss reserve fund could be created in either program, this would merely shift the burden to those schools and ultimately to those borrowers that do not default, which is not fair to responsible schools and individuals.

A better method for reducing taxpayer risk is to reduce the number of high default institutions. The Department has limited defaults by eliminating 609 institutions since 1991 from the student loan programs for persistent, excessive default rates. As a result of the efforts of the U.S. Department of Education to improve its management of the student aid programs, the student loan cohort default rate has declined from 22.4 percent in fiscal year 1990 to 15 percent in fiscal year 1992.

The Direct Loan Program is one of the best examples of how government is able to reinvent existing programs to deliver service at less cost, with less bureaucracy, greater simplicity, and improved benefits to citizens. The Direct Loan Program and other elements of the Student Loan Reform Act will save taxpayers over \$4.3 billion through fiscal year 1998—and will save students \$2 billion—by reforming and eliminating a maze of lenders, guaranty agencies, and secondary loan markets. Direct Loan Program savings to federal taxpayers will increase as the number of postsecondary education institutions in the program increases.

The Direct Loan Program allows student borrowers to repay their loans under any of four new, flexible repayment plans, including an income-contingent repayment plan. These plans allow borrowers to tailor their repayments to their individual financial circumstances and career goals, thereby increasing the likelihood that loans will be paid in full.

Assertion: Congress needs to place "market pressures into the student loan process."

Response: While the old student loan system included little competition or accountability, the Direct Loan Program is a partnership between the public and private sectors and relies on the competitive forces of the private sector. Private companies are selected through a competitive process to service Direct Loans, and their rates are based on market forces. By comparison, under the guaranteed loan program (Federal Family Education Loan Program), the rates charged by banks and guarantors are set by statute rather than through competition.

The U.S. Department of Education's use of competitive contracting for Direct Loan servicing and collection is building a much more effective partnership with the private sector than exists under the Federal Family Education Loan Program.

Making the Grade



What Goals 2000 Means to Our Schools

by
Linda S. Page

A FOCUS ON THE FAMILY
**A Matter of
Facts**
REPORT



Focus on the Family

Making the Grade

What Goals 2000 Means to Our Schools

By
Linda S. Page
Manager of Education Policy

Focus on the Family on Education



Focus on the Family is committed to parental rights and local control as the defining elements of educational policy, planning, and implementation. The very essence of educational excellence relies on the recognition of the traditional family as the key social institution of society and the education of children as both the right and the responsibility of parents. It is essential that local control and parental rights guide the discussion of all educational content and school programs.

Focus on the Family Supports these Education Outcomes

- **Meaningful parental involvement and genuine decision-making authority in curriculum, instructional materials, and teaching strategies**
- **Measurable academic results based on setting goals and objectives in basic subjects, including math, literature, history, science, music, and art with an emphasis on core academics—the basics—instead of spending the limited available school day on social issues which are not integral to the academic program**
- **High standards of success for all students in core academics as measured by objective nationally-normed standardized tests**
- **Religious freedom in schools which allow students to exercise their religious convictions without fear of reprisal, including voluntary student prayer**
- **Truth in curriculum subject matter, not relativism; accurate presentation of traditional knowledge, not a "politically correct" presentation of trendy information**
- **The teaching of our country's Judeo-Christian religious heritage as part of the history of our country**
- **Character education based on the virtues of honesty, self-discipline, compassion, responsibility, friendship, hard work, courage, perseverance, loyalty, and faith**
- **Sex education programs based on pre-marital "abstinence only" and moral responsibility; programs which safeguard students from inappropriate mixed gender classes at**

Who to Contact to Express Your Opinion

The President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington D.C. 20500
White House Comment Line: (202) 456-1111

The Honorable _____
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510
(Dear Senator _____)

The Honorable _____
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington D.C. 20515
(Dear Representative _____)

To reach your senator or congressman's Washington D.C. office directly, call the Capitol switchboard at (202) 224-3121. You may also locate the phone number of their local office in the government section of your telephone directory.

To obtain copies of legislation from the U.S. House of Representatives, call the House Document Room at (202) 225-3456.

To obtain copies of senate legislative bills, write to the Senate Document Room at the Hart Office Building, Room B04, Washington, D.C. 20510 (limit six items per letter).

For information on the status of pending legislation, call the Legislative Information Line at (202) 225-1772.

To contact your state representatives, governor, state superintendent of schools, or local school district office (for school board members), see the government pages of your local telephone directory.

The Eight National Goals of the Goals 2000 Program

1. *By the year 2000, all children in America will start school "ready to learn."*
2. *By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.*
3. *By the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter, including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.*
4. *By the year 2000, the nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century.*
5. *By the year 2000, U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.*
6. *By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.*
7. *By the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.*
8. *By the year 2000, every school and home will engage in partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children.*

To the casual reader, these goals might seem innocuous. However, they signal a drastic shift in the roles of both government and families, with government claiming the right to 'partnership' in the raising of our children.

-- Cathy Duffy, National Center for Home Education.

Sample Questions Parents Should Ask Local School District Administrators

1. Has our state accepted Goals 2000 planning money? Why did we accept it?
2. Where are we in the process? Ask for specifics.
3. What is our school district doing to implement Goals 2000?
4. Where can I get copies of our state's goals or standards?
5. How can I get on the state's standards committee?
6. What kinds of testing are being proposed at the state level to measure progress toward achieving the standards? Will parents be permitted to comment on the testing process? Who will finally decide what kind of test will be used?
7. What kind of testing is planned for use at our district level? May I view copies?
8. How will education under Goals 2000 be different than it was before? How do we know that the new programs will work better than what we are doing now?
9. How can I be involved in making decisions about new programs, materials and tests? Is a review panel in place?

9. Treat teachers and administrators with courtesy and respect. They will more likely respond sympathetically and supportively to your concerns.
10. To order your own copy of the revealing National History Standards contact:

National Center for History in the Schools
10880 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 761
Los Angeles, CA 90024-4108
Phone -- (310) 825-4702
Fax -- (310) 825-4723
The cost is \$29.95

What's a Family To Do?

Families can do a great deal. Start by not giving up! First, you can write to your state legislators and ask them to refuse to participate in Goals 2000. Next, write to your congressional representatives and ask them to repeal Goals 2000 and Improving America's School Act (the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) in favor of block grants to states. Also, write to your state legislators to find out exactly what is being done in your state to implement the School-to-Work law. Take steps to ensure that the quality of your children's education is not sacrificed as the requirements of this law are implemented. (To obtain copies of the National History Standards legislation, write to the address that appears on the next page.) These steps are both vital and urgent.

Here are some additional ways in which families can work to minimize the intrusion of federal requirements into their children's schooling.

1. Become and remain continuously well-informed about school curricula and materials. Know what your children are being taught.
2. Become actively involved in school activities that relate to your key areas of concern. Show you care.
3. Participate in school government and work to strengthen local control. It is a given that local needs can best be identified at the local level.
4. Stay in regular contact with your child's teacher and principal. Develop a meaningful relationship with them so they can clearly see that your driving interest is the welfare of your child.
5. Review your children's school assignments with them. Talk to your children about their assignments, activities, and specific aspects of their school day.
6. Attend school board meetings and become knowledgeable about school district policies. Find out what the complaint and input procedures are for your specific areas of concern.
7. Become well informed about the education beliefs and voting record of legislators and communicate regularly, succinctly, and politely with them. Be sure to vote.
8. Ask questions until you are satisfied that your children are being taught what you believe they should be learning.

of key historical events, and subjects pertaining to special interest groups. The result is that the standards fail to honor the commonalities that have made our country great: the noble heritage of our governmental institutions and laws; the world-envied success of our economy; and the critical role of religion and the traditional family. Instead, they emphasize the real or perceived wrongs done by America as a nation.

Do Parents Have Any Rights Left?

Title X of Goals 2000 is the only provision in this legislation that offers parents safeguards for their children's education. This section requires schools to "allow" parents to inspect a wide range of instructional materials, such as teachers' manuals, videos, and psychological tests. Furthermore, schools are not to force students to reveal family income, psychological problems, or political affiliation. Such minimal safeguards, while offering little comfort, are essential for maintaining a small degree of parental control in areas of values. Parents must be diligent in using all available avenues to protect their children.

How Will My Local Schools Change?

When Goals 2000 is fully implemented, the impact on textbooks, course work, testing, and teacher training programs will be profound. Not only will textbooks be written with the national goals as a guide, but accreditation programs, standardized tests, and other classroom materials must adhere to these national goals as well. Consider three examples: sex education, the "Parents as Teachers" provision (Section 402 (2) (J), and history instruction.

Sex education Goals 2000 opens wide the door to school-based health clinics and the entire liberal sex-ed agenda. Social service agencies and special interest groups will have easier access to our school children when these services are offered at school.

"Parents as Teachers" provision This component will allow for government interference in the lives of families of "at risk" children. Since government program officers will decide which children are "at risk," the potential danger to parents who are judged to be "politically incorrect" is grave and real. Children who are required to attend church against their will could be classified "at risk" and the parents could be dealt with accordingly.

History instruction One of the most frightening examples of the potential for damage became clear with the release of the proposed history standards. Although the United States History Standards document states that "... knowledge of history is the precondition of political intelligence,"¹ the standards also state, "All historical study involves selection and ordering of information in light of general ideas and values."² Whose ideas? Whose values? The answer to those questions quickly becomes clear in an exploration of the content of the new History Standards.

Samples abound of the warped revision of history proposed for our students. Consider the complete omission of American heroes such as Robert E. Lee, Thomas Edison, Albert Einstein, and Daniel Webster, while McCarthy and McCarthyism are mentioned 19 times and the Ku Klux Klan, 17 times. The Korean War is allotted two sentences while the Vietnam War receives two pages.

These standards reconfigure the importance of various people and events either by excessive emphasis or omission. In so doing, they attempt to condition students' thinking with politically-correct treatment

¹ National History Standards. 1994, p. 1.

² Ibid, p. 3.

education. This educational approach produces human robots, individuals only capable of performing particular tasks, rather than the thinking, creative, fruitful humans God created us to be.

Why Should We Be Concerned about "Opportunity To Learn" Standards?

The "Opportunity to Learn" section of Goals 2000 asks all states to assess whether every child in the state has an equal opportunity to learn. The hope of the supporters of this bill is that if all students have equal opportunities to learn in every way, they will succeed in achieving national education goals. This includes addressing whether all students have equal access to the same quantity and quality of technology, facilities, instructional materials, teachers who are competent and take advantage of ongoing professional development, and "other factors that the Council deems appropriate" (Section 213 (G)). What are these other "factors"? Research overwhelmingly shows that the family makes the most significant contribution to a child's educational attainment. Given this fact, will the Council seek to regulate families that have opposing educational philosophies "if it deems appropriate"? The implications this raises are very serious.

How Will These Goals Be Tested?

With the increased emphasis on national goals and standards, it is logical to believe that the National Center for Education Statistics (the office in the Department of Education responsible for testing at the national level) will play an increasingly important role. Under Goals 2000, states are required to develop their own state-wide testing systems to evaluate their progress toward achievement of state standards. Since all students are expected to succeed under Goals 2000, and the content is to be challenging, these state-wide testing programs will bear close scrutiny.

In addition, the School-to-Work law provides for tracking the success of selected students over a period of years to determine whether the education program is successful. This will mean testing and monitoring students through more careful records than has been legislated in the past. This raises questions about respect for family privacy.

How Will the *National Education Standards and Improvement Council* (NESIC) Function?

If the National Education Standards and Improvement Council is finally appointed as provided for by Goals 2000, it will serve as a national school board and will certify educational content standards on a national level. Since special interest groups clearly have major influence on who is appointed to key policy and power positions in education, this appointed board will more than likely be controlled by the liberal education lobby. The most alarming aspect of this council is the enormous power it will wield over what is taught in our schools and how students are tested.

What is the *National Goals Panel*?

The mandate of the National Goals Panel is to act as the "supreme court" of education. It will have the authority for final approval of national content standards, national student performance standards, and national opportunity-to-learn standards. This panel will also certify state academic and job-skills standards. This new bureaucracy is likely to create – not solve – new problems without improving the quality of education for our children. Concerns of local communities and parents will more easily be ignored with the center of control so far removed from the local level.

What Is the *National Skills Standards Board*?

The National Skills Standards Board will decide what "prospective employees" (our children) need to know before they enter the work force. By the end of 1995, this board proposes to identify occupation "clusters." Government certification will be required to find work within these clusters, and the National Skills Standards Board will define what skill accomplishments are required for that certification. Schools, and, in turn, businesses, will be expected to adopt these standards in order to remain consistent with government guidelines. Students will be expected to achieve these standards in order to be certified by the government for many areas of employment. In essence, our children will be trained to work in jobs that government "futurists" have determined will be in demand in the next century. The problem is that our children will be gaining skills and not a well-rounded liberal

Even though the language of Goals 2000 is replete with voluntary provisions and the language of flexibility, it is clear that state standards must still reflect the national standards in order to receive either Goals 2000 or Improving America's Schools Act funding. Of additional concern to parents is that some of the provisions of the law could open the door to powerful new lobbies, social service agencies, and other entities which can potentially remove children further from parental influence and authority within the context of the education program.

How Will Goals 2000 Differ From Our Current Education System?

Goals 2000 creates the framework for a de facto shift in control away from local school districts and parents and places that framework under the authority of several new federal and state bureaucracies. A detailed analysis of the law reveals that, in many cases, political appointees will replace dedicated parents, excellent teachers, and a caring community in setting key educational goals and evaluation standards at the local level. These new education-related bureaucracies will have the power to define the future of American education by setting the structure and guidelines by which states and local districts will have to abide. If carried to the ultimate possibilities, parents will have little to say about what they want their children to be taught and what values are presented in their child's education. Being in favor of genuine local control and meaningful parental involvement means respecting the parent's right to choose any school—public, private or religious—which they feel will best suit their child.

How Will This Happen?

Goals 2000 establishes three new centers of federal power:

- the National Goals Panel
- the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC)
- the National Skills Standards Board

Even though federal education officials claim that local involvement will be entirely "voluntary," that seems highly unlikely once millions of dollars in federal funds are funneled into the system through Goals 2000 and Improving America's Schools Act (Elementary and Secondary Education Act). The reality is that 79 percent of Improving America's Schools Act funding is tied directly to whether localities comply with Goals 2000. It is a historical observation that federal control follows federal money, and there is no evidence that the situation will be different this time.

Even though we want all students to succeed, success will have to be redefined and the standards adjusted under Goals 2000, just as they were when the levels on the S.A.T. test were revised, in order for "all students" to succeed. If students are to reach "challenging academic standards" (which they are far from attaining at this point), what will have to change? Does this explain why there is a new emphasis on values and attitudes instead of on knowledge, facts and information? Also, the "good deal of flexibility" needed to implement the Goals 2000 requirements places an enormous amount of power in the hands of people who have the authority to decide what, how, why, and when states can be flexible in their educational programs. We should return to what parents want; emphasis on core academic knowledge.

How can a state commit to a "reasonable chance of success" for every student unless the standards are lowered or changed? What new component can be incorporated into the educational system to achieve the goals that huge monetary increases and an increased emphasis on educational issues for the past ten years have not been able to attain?

The pervasive philosophy expressed in ensuring that all children will succeed in school is actually more a statement of lowering standards and political correctness than one promoting high academic standards. Since we know that all children are not the same, either in abilities or interests, the underlying implication is that educational standards will be lowered in order to assure the success of all students -- even though the law calls this raising standards.

The unrelenting emphasis on preparing students for citizenship and the workplace based on futurists' views of the world is not based in reality. No one knew the Berlin Wall would fall -- even the day before it happened -- so how can a futurist know what students should be trained to know and do to succeed in a world we haven't experienced? While it is true that technology is rapidly increasing, and our children should be prepared to compete in a highly technological world, relying on crystal balls and a utopian ideal as the basis for educational goals places the education of our children on very shaky ground. Instead, we should be holding students and teachers accountable for learning core academics which will help them be better equipped to live in whatever kind of world they find themselves.

Local control under Goals 2000 has to work within the standards defined by each state and as recommended in federal law. Parental involvement, the eighth of the National Goals established by Goals 2000, emphasizes the importance of the role of parents, but nowhere is the most important kind of parental involvement supported --- their right to decide what and how their children will be taught.

What is Goals 2000?

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act, signed into law on March 31, 1994 by President Clinton, is the centerpiece of a three-part legislative package which also includes Improving America's Schools Act (re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), and the School-to-Work Opportunities bill. These bills further remove genuine local control over the education of students and diminish the importance of the family in making educational decisions about their children. Local control of education is part of our American heritage and the increasing federal and state "voluntary" goals, guidelines, and obtrusive mandates are seriously eroding this right.

The Goals 2000 education reform package puts into place an organizational structure that will dramatically change education in this country for the worse. The Improving America's Schools Act which was signed into law on October 20, 1994, strengthens the key provisions of the Goals 2000 legislation and essentially negates their "voluntary" nature. The School-to-Work Opportunities law (S1361) provides funding and encouragement for partnerships among the federal government, businesses, and schools. These institutions are to work together to determine future work force needs and to make recommendations about how students should be trained in school to prepare to work in the future economic environment. Still under discussion are requirements that a student pass tests regarding their "positive work attitude" and their "ability to work well in a group," a clear movement toward the testing of attitudes and values in the classroom.

What Is Troubling about Goals 2000?

Even though much of the language in these laws sounds positive and harmless on the surface, a closer look reveals that they serve to strengthen the top-down structure of education even though they use the language of local control. This could significantly impact the rights of families in matters relating to the education of their children.

According to a Goals 2000 document published by the United States Department of Education in February 1995, "The main requirements of the law are that: (1) these approaches be aimed at helping all students reach challenging academic standards set by each state; (2) these approaches have a reasonable chance of success; (3) that there is a significant commitment within the state to implementing them; and, (4) that they provide for a good deal of local flexibility."

About the Author

Linda Page serves as Educational Policy Manager in the Public Policy Division of Focus on the Family. In this capacity she advises on national and states' education issues, develops education policy recommendations and is a much in demand media guest and public speaker on these issues.

Previously, Linda worked for 17 years in the California public schools as a principal, reading specialist and classroom teacher. Her other accomplishments include managing Hughes Aircraft Company's K-12 Education Partnership Programs and hosting a San Francisco Bay area cable television program on education issues.

Linda received her M.S. degree from California State University, Hayward and did her undergraduate work at San Jose State University. She also holds a California Administrator's Credential, a California Teaching Credential and the Ryan Act Reading Specialist Credential, K-12.

Linda has two children and currently resides in Colorado Springs.

Focus on the Family
Colorado Springs, CO 80995

This publication may be reproduced for non-commercial purposes without permission from Focus on the Family. Moderate editing for length, which does not change its substance or intent, is also permissible. Copyright 1995 Focus on the Family. All Rights Reserved. International Copyright Secured. Printed in the U.S.A.

When reproducing under another organization's name, please cite as follows: Originally published by Focus on the Family. Copyright 1995 Focus on the Family.

Christian Coalition Presents The Contract With The American Family

Introduction

In the 1994 midterm elections, the American people elected the first Republican Congress in 40 years in what was the largest transfer of power from a minority party to a majority party in the twentieth century. The message of the election was clear: the American people want lower taxes, less government, strong families, protection of innocent human life, and traditional values.

The 104th Congress devoted its first hundred days to the Contract with America, including a Balanced Budget Amendment, tax relief for families, welfare reform, and term limits. Christian Coalition enthusiastically supported the Contract and launched one of the most extensive grassroots campaigns in its history to support the Contract's passage. The Coalition will continue this effort as the Contract moves through the Senate.

The problems our nation faces are not all fiscal in nature. The American people are increasingly concerned about the coarsening of the culture, the breakup of the family, and a decline in civility. A recent Los Angeles Times poll reported that 53 percent of Americans believe the moral problems facing our country are more important than the economic problems.¹ Other survey data indicates that 80 percent of Americans believe there is a problem of declining morality within our nation.²

The *Contract with the American Family* is a bold agenda for Congress intended to strengthen families and restore common-sense values. The Contract represents a valuable contribution to a congressional agenda beyond the first hundred days. These provisions are the ten suggestions, not the Ten Commandments. There is no deadline or specified time period during which they are to be enacted. But Congress would be well advised to act with all due and deliberate speed. The provisions in the Contract enjoy support from 60 to 90 percent of the American people.

These items do not represent the pro-family movement's entire agenda. There are many other prominent pro-family organizations that will work on many other issues - women in combat, welfare reform, budget policy - in the months ahead. This contract is designed to be the first word, not the last word, in developing a bold and incremental start to strengthening the family and restoring values.

Restoring Religious Equality

A constitutional amendment to protect the religious liberties of Americans in public places.

With each passing year, people of faith grow increasingly distressed by the hostility of public institutions toward religious expression. Public interest law firms dedicated to preserving religious liberties receive thousands of calls every year on issues pertaining to the rights of students in public schools.

Examples of hostility toward religious values and those who hold them abound. In Nevada, an elementary school student chosen to sing a solo in the school's Christmas pageant was forbidden from singing "The First Noel" because of its religious overtones.³ At a public elementary school in Rhode Island, the principal announced shortly before the beginning of a Christmas concert that he had censored all of the pageant's songs.⁴ A Scarsdale, New York school board banned all religious celebrations from schools, although parties with non-holiday themes were still permitted. According to the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, the ban included "displays or exhibits, such as wreaths, garlands, caroling and menorahs that appear to promote or give approval to religious matters," as well as "candy canes, bells, holiday music, and Hanukkah or Christmas parties and concerts."⁵ Teachers in New Jersey were told to avoid references to Easter, including jelly beans and the colors purple and yellow.

Children have been told they cannot read the Bible during silent reading time.⁶ In one school, a little girl was told there was a problem with the book she chose to read to her class - it mentioned "God" four times.⁷

This anti-religious bigotry is not confined to the classroom. Nativity scenes are now barred from federal post offices,⁸ and from the lawns of public buildings unless accompanied by a non-religious display such as Santa Claus. Some

courthouses are prohibited from displaying the Ten Commandments (despite the fact that they are chiseled into the walls of the United States Supreme Court). And landlords have been sued by the state for discrimination because they refused to rent to unmarried couples for religious reasons.⁹

This hostility toward faith is the result of 30 years of confusing and often quixotic jurisprudence in establishment clause cases. The Supreme Court's application of the three-pronged "Lemon test," first developed in *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (1971),¹⁰ has become so tortuous that some court decisions allow states to lend textbooks, but not movie projectors, maps, or laboratory equipment to parochial schools; to supply guidance counseling services outside of parochial schools, such as mobile units, but not within the schools; and to provide bus services to and from parochial schools, but not for school field trips.¹¹ Justice Scalia, who like many has argued for ending the use of this confusing test, has likened it to "some ghoul in a late-night horror movie that repeatedly sits up in its grave and shuffles abroad, after being repeatedly killed and buried."¹²

Despite such rollbacks in religious rights, the American public consistently supports freedom of religious expression in the public square. An April 1994 Wirthlin poll indicates that reinstating voluntary school prayer not only continues to receive overwhelming support (78 percent of Americans), but it also enjoys support across a broad spectrum of Americans: 79 percent of African Americans and 80 percent of whites support school prayer; 85 percent of low income and 71 percent of high income Americans support school prayer; and 65 percent of non-Christians and between 80 and 94 percent of Christians support school prayer.

The Religious Equality Amendment would not restore compulsory, sectarian prayer or Bible-reading dictated by government officials. Instead, we seek a balanced approach that allows voluntary, student and citizen-initiated free speech in non-compulsory settings such as courthouse lawns, high school graduation ceremonies, and sports events.

A survey by the Luntz Research Company found that 78 percent of all Americans support a Religious Equality Amendment. We urge the 104th Congress to pass an amendment that not only protects the rights of students, but the religious liberties of all Americans.

Returning Education Control to the

Local Level

Transfer funding of the federal Department of Education to families and local school boards.

The need for education reform is plainly evident if one considers the trends of recent decades. SAT scores have dropped by more than 75 points since 1960.

13 Ten nations outperform U.S. 13-year-olds in math and science tests.*14* And as education performance drops, the level of school violence in our schools is on the rise. The dramatic increase in shootings and violence-related injuries occurring in our nation's schools is well-known. Because of the prevalence of weapons, many American students are greeted with metal detectors when they arrive for school in the morning. In 1992, 10 percent of tenth-graders admitted they had taken a weapon to school during the past month.*15* There are 250,000 crimes committed on school property each year.

Parents are distressed over the failure of schools to teach children basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Too often, sex education emphasizes contraception and condom use rather than abstinence and self-control.

Homosexuality is promoted as an acceptable alternative lifestyle.

Outcome-based education (OBE) supplants basic skills. Psychological counseling takes place without parental involvement or notification.*16* Christian Coalition members believe schools should reinforce rather than undermine the values taught in homes, churches and synagogues.

Parental involvement and local control is the most pressing need in education today. A current report by the U.S. Department of Education, "Strong Families, Strong Schools," corroborates the fact that parental involvement in children's education results in higher student performance.*17* Many local and state reform initiatives focus on increasing parental rights and participation in their children's education.

Despite this trend at the local level, the federal government has done little to advance these initiatives. In 1993 and 1994, Congress tightened the federal choke hold on local schools by passing Goals 2000, the Educate America Act *18* and the Improving America's Schools Act, which re-authorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).*19*

Christian Coalition seeks to return greater power and control over our

children's education to parents and local communities. This reform begins by transferring much of the funding for the U.S. Department of Education to families and local school boards, and applying the remainder to deficit reduction.

The U.S. currently spends approximately \$275 billion per year on public education.²⁰ Yet student performance and educational achievement do not reflect this financial investment. As Time magazine recently noted, "The U.S. spends a greater percentage of its gross national product on education (7.5 percent) than any other country except Israel, and yet is out-performed in math and science among 13-year-olds by more than 10 nations, including Hungary, Taiwan and the former Soviet Union."²¹ Less than half of federal education dollars reach classrooms for instruction.²²

Increased spending is not the answer. In fact, the 10 states ranking highest in education performance do not top per-pupil expenditures.²³ Rather, the answer lies in eliminating bureaucracies, administrative costs, and federal restrictions that prevent effective reform at the local level.

Since the time of its creation in 1980, the U.S. Department of Education has grown in magnitude to the point that it now consists of 241 separate programs, a budget of \$30 billion,²⁴ and more than 5,000 employees.²⁵ Moreover, federal control over education has dramatically increased, ultimately culminating with the 1994 passage of Goals 2000 and H.R. 6, the Improving America's Schools Act.

Goals 2000 established several new federal bureaucracies, including the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC), which many view as equivalent to a national school board. NESIC has powerful authority to certify national education standards regarding educational content and student performance. Although these standards are not binding on states, they do have national stature, and states have to "voluntarily" develop comparable standards in order to receive a portion of the billions of dollars in federal funding authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

When Congress passed Goals 2000, many people predicted it would lead to the establishment of "politically-correct" national education standards, resulting in the introduction of outcome-based education (OBE) on a national scale. Verification of this prediction came quickly.

With 1994's release of national history standards, developed with \$2.2 million in

federal funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the U.S. Department of Education, it became obvious that national education standards would not be objective.²⁶ Criticism of the biased and distorted views prevalent in both sets of standards - the National Standards for United States History, as well as the National Standards for World History - was widespread. Criticism of the U.S. History standards included the fact that the United States Constitution was never mentioned in any of the 31 standards, and was relegated to the supporting materials;²⁷ the establishment of the National Organization of Women and Sierra Club were viewed as notable events, but not the first assembling of the United States Congress;²⁸ and according to one reviewer, the material revealed only one quotation from a congressional leader, and that was Tip O'Neill calling Ronald Reagan "a cheerleader for selfishness."²⁹ The World History standards drew widespread criticism also, particularly for their anti-Western bias.³⁰

The bias in these standards was so grave that the United States Senate overwhelmingly adopted (99 to 1) a resolution condemning the standards and expressing the sense of the Senate that NESIC not certify them.³¹

Nevertheless, 10,000 copies of these standards already have been mailed to school administrators and others throughout the nation.³² These national standards undermine parental involvement and local control of education.

The time to return federal education control to parents and local communities through elimination of the United States Department of Education is long overdue, and a good first step would include repealing Goals 2000 legislation.

Promoting School Choice

Enactment of legislation that will enhance parents' choice of schools for their children.

School choice initiatives are sweeping the nation like wildfire. Sixty-two percent of Americans favor choice among public schools, and 50 percent favor vouchers.³³ School choice legislation was either introduced or pending in 34 states in 1993.³⁴ These initiatives take a number of forms, including voucher programs, tax credits and charter schools.

Voucher programs provide monetary assistance to parents for use at the school of their choice. Tuition tax credits achieve the same goal of school

choice, and are preferred by some communities. Charter schools are a creative new initiative through which states charter and fund alternative schools designed to meet the needs of a diverse student population. Other local initiatives include the privatization of public schools, such as in Baltimore, Maryland and Hartford, Connecticut. As parents and local communities strive to reform our country's educational system, the federal government must do more to assist these efforts.

One possible example of federal school choice legislation is S. 618, the Coats-Lieberman Low-income School Choice Demonstration Act. This legislation would establish up to 20 demonstration projects that would provide financial assistance to low-income parents to help them send their children to the school of their choice, whether public or private. The legislation requires an evaluation of the effectiveness of this demonstration initiative in order to provide objective documentation of the merits of school choice. With almost half of high school students in inner city schools failing to graduate,³⁵ educational reform for low-income parents in these cities is becoming increasingly urgent.

We urge the swift passage of school choice legislation such as S. 618 during the 104th Congress as a means of promoting school choice for parents. We believe passage of this bill will spur grassroots efforts to reform education and give parents greater choice in selecting the best school for their children.

Protecting Parental Rights

Enactment of a Parental Rights Act and defeat of the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The United States Constitution does not explicitly set forth protections for parental rights, but a long line of court cases have held that the United States Constitution protects the right of parents to control the upbringing of their children. The rights of parents, however, are under increasing assault in modern day society.

For example, state officials removed an eighth-grade girl from her home because she objected to the ground rules (regarding use of drugs, curfew

hours, etc.) her parents had set.³⁶ One mother's child was removed from her home because the mother refused to continue to take her first-grade child to therapy lessons for hyperactivity.³⁷ And in 1992, a San Diego grand jury found that 35 to 70 percent of the county's foster children "never should have been removed from their parental homes."³⁸

Enactment of a Parental Rights Act will ensure that parental rights are not violated and ensure that parents have the foremost duty and responsibility to direct the upbringing of their children. Representatives Steve Largent (R-OK) and Mike Parker (D-MS) in the House, and Senators Charles Grassley (R-IA) and Howell Heflin (D-AL) in the Senate, are drafting a parental rights act to address this critical problem. While language is still being finalized, the authors intend that the Parental Rights Act of 1995 will clarify that "the right of parents to direct the upbringing of their children," includes overseeing their children's education, health care, discipline, and religious training. Moreover, it requires that any governmental interference in the parent-child relationship be justified by "clear and convincing evidence" that it "is essential to accomplish a compelling governmental interest" and that it is applied in "the least restrictive means" possible.

The threat to the rights of America's parents is very real, as the movement to ratify the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child exemplifies. The Convention on the Rights of the Child is a human rights treaty adopted in 1989 by the General Assembly of the United Nations. It has not been ratified in the United States. In the past, the United States has not supported the treaty due to concerns that it may concede jurisdiction over United States citizens to an international body and international court.³⁹

Christian Coalition opposes the treaty because it interferes with the parent-child relationship, threatens the sovereignty of U.S. law, and elevates as "rights" such dubious provisions as access to television and mass media. The following are some of the examples of the absolute rights given to children through this treaty:

- "No child shall be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful interference with his or her privacy, family, home or correspondence - The child has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks."⁴⁰
- "The child shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form

of art, or through any other media of the child's choice."41

- With respect to the right of the child to freedom of association or peaceful assembly, "[n]o restrictions may be placed on the exercise of these rights other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, public order, the protection of public health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others."42

Under the treaty, parents could well lose their right to prevent their child from associating with disreputable individuals such as delinquents, or receiving literature or gaining access to mass media communication (including films and television) that is not age-appropriate.

Pursuant to the treaty, a Committee on the Rights of the Child has been established to review reports from nations regarding their progress in implementing the treaty. The committee has urged that in the area of sex education, parents be required to give the opinion of the child equal weight. The committee warned that "the possibility for parents in England and Wales to withdraw their children from parts of the sex education programmes in schools" undermines "the right of the child to express his/her opinion."43

The committee's concern about soliciting children's views prior to "exclusion from school" should be of particular concern to parents who educate their children at home. It is clear that rejection of this treaty by the United States Senate would be in the best interests of American parents.

Family-Friendly Tax Relief

Reduce the tax burden on the American family, eliminate the marriage penalty, and pass the Mothers and Homemakers' Rights Act to remedy the unequal treatment that homemakers receive under the Internal Revenue Service Code with respect to saving for retirement.

It has been said that the intact family is the most successful Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ever conceived. Yet the federal government, through the tax code, has punished families for working, saving, and staying together. The *Contract with the American Family* addresses not only the cultural pressures on families, but the financial pressures as well.

1. Tax relief for families with children.

In 1950 the average family of four in America paid just 2 percent of its adjusted gross income in federal income taxes. Today that same family sends one out of every four dollars to Washington. When state and local taxes are added, the average family of four pays 38 percent of its entire income in taxes, more than it spends on such essentials as housing, clothing and food.

Christian Coalition's top legislative priority since 1993 has been tax relief for America's hard-working families. We strongly favor the \$500 tax credit for children that has been passed by the House and awaits action in the Senate. Our long-term goal is to restore the standard deduction for children to its inflation-adjusted 1946 value: \$8,000 to \$10,000 per dependent child.

Christian Coalition also supports in concept a flat or flattened tax (with a generous personal exemption for children) as an ultimate goal to simplify the tax code, reward work and savings, and reduce the crushing tax burden on families.

2. Eliminate the marriage penalty.

Under current law, many married couples pay more in taxes than they would if they remained single because their combined income puts them into a higher tax bracket. On April 5, 1995, as part of the American Dream Restoration Act, the House of Representatives voted to restore tax fairness for married couples. H.R. 1215 makes married couples eligible for a tax rebate of up to \$145 if their tax liability goes up as a result of being married. In a time when family breakups are so common, the Senate should pass this legislation to encourage marriage and ease the burden on families trying to form and stay together.

3. The Mothers and Homemakers Rights Act.

The *Contract with the American Family* calls for the enactment of legislation such as the Hutchison-Mikulski Individual Retirement Account equity bill (S. 287), which will allow homemakers to contribute up to \$2,000 annually toward an IRA, thereby providing equitable treatment to spouses who work at home.

The Internal Revenue Code currently allows a double-income married couple to contribute up to \$4,000 per year toward retirement by allowing them to contribute up to \$2,000 each toward an IRA. However, in the case

of a single-income married couple, the couple can only contribute up to \$2,250 per year toward retirement through an IRA, with the homemaker's contribution limited to \$250. This inequity in the tax code reflects a disrespect for the valuable role of the homemaker in our society. Christian Coalition urges Congress to remedy this injustice by amending the tax code to allow homemakers to contribute equally up to \$2,000 annually toward an IRA. This could provide an increase of up to \$150,000 in savings for a couple after 30 years.⁴⁴ Furthermore, because the value of families never decreases, the contribution amount should be indexed to inflation.

Restoring Respect for Human Life

Protecting the rights of states that do not fund abortion, protecting innocent human life by placing real limits on late-term abortions, and ending funds to organizations that promote and perform abortions.

In speaking to the National Prayer Breakfast in 1994, Mother Teresa delivered an eloquent and stirring defense of the rights of innocent human life. "The greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion," Mother Teresa of Calcutta said at the National Prayer Breakfast in February 1994. "It is a war against the child, a direct killing of the innocent child."⁴⁵

The foundation of all our rights as Americans - to speech, assembly, and religious expression - are all built upon the right to life. The genius of the American idea is that every person is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights, the first of which is the right to life.

Christian Coalition seeks by all lawful and non-violent means to protect innocent human life for the disabled, the elderly, the infirm, and the unborn. We support constitutional and statutory protection for the unborn child. Our ultimate goal is to establish the humanity of the unborn child and to see a day when every child is safe in their mother's womb.

We urge Congress to take the following action as a beginning toward that end.

- 1. Real limits on late-term abortions by providing legal protection to**

children in the latter months of pregnancy and ending the practice of "partial-birth abortions."

Most Americans would be shocked to learn about the methods that are used in late-term abortions in America today. These methods have reached the point to where a fully formed child can be completely delivered alive, with the exception of the child's head, and then the abortionist is free to end the child's life. This "partial-birth abortion" procedure is also known as "dilation and extraction," or D&X, in which forceps are used to remove second and third-trimester babies, with only the head remaining inside the uterus. The child's life is then ended, and the dead child is delivered.⁴⁶

Most tragic of all is the fact that the majority of these babies are alive until the end of the proceeding.⁴⁷ Indeed, virtually all of the victims are beyond the 24th week of pregnancy, and many can survive outside the womb.

It is difficult to estimate the number of partial-birth abortions performed, because abortion statistics in general are unreliable. The Alan Guttmacher Institute, a research group affiliated with Planned Parenthood, estimates that about 10 percent of abortions occur in the second or third trimester. One abortionist who specializes in D&X procedures testified in 1992 that he had performed 700 of them.⁴⁸

Establishing real limits on late-term abortions is one of the most important steps Congress can take to protect innocent human life. A child has a better than 50-percent chance of survival outside its mother's womb at 26 weeks.⁴⁹ But the D&X technique has been used on children up to 40 weeks gestation, which is a full-term pregnancy.⁵⁰ One physician experienced in this procedure admitted to having mixed feelings on its morality:

"I do have moral compunctions. And if I see a case that's later, like after 20 weeks where it frankly is a child to me, I really agonize over it because the potential is so imminently there. I think, 'Gee, it's too bad that this child couldn't be adopted.'"⁵¹

We call on the 104th Congress to enact restrictions on late-term abortions and end the practice of D&X abortion. Children at any stage of pregnancy should not be subject to this cruel and inhumane form of death, but such treatment of those who can clearly survive outside the mother's womb is particularly cruel.

2. Protect the rights of states that do not wish to use taxpayer funds to take innocent human life.

In 1993 Congress re-authorized the Hyde Amendment, in effect since 1977, with rape and incest exceptions. Christian Coalition believes taxpayer funds should only be used to pay for an abortion when the mother's life is in danger.

The Clinton administration issued a new interpretation of the Hyde Amendment, and rather than permitting states to use Medicaid dollars to fund abortion in rape and incest cases, it requires them to do so. This created havoc in the states because 30 states prohibited public funding of abortion, with the life of the mother being the sole exception. Another six states had reporting requirements for abortions due to rape and incest which were invalidated under this new directive. As a result, many states are now involved in litigation over this issue and seven states are facing administrative enforcement proceedings which could ultimately result in the termination of federal Medicaid funding to the state. Moreover, as a result of litigation, two state constitutional provisions have been invalidated and now the states are required to pay for abortion for any reason, with state funds. Enacting legislation to clarify the congressional intent behind the Hyde amendment and to protect states' rights in this area is a matter of urgency for the 104th Congress.

The Coalition urges Congress to adopt the Istook/Exxon Amendment that would protect the rights of the citizens of states that do not use taxpayer funds to take human life.

3. End taxpayer subsidies to organizations that promote and perform abortions.

We call for an end to federal funding for organizations that promote and perform abortions. This includes an end to funding for international family planning organizations that promote and perform abortions.

Christian Coalition, along with numerous American taxpayers, believes that abortion is the taking of innocent human life and that tax dollars should not be used to promote it. Yet, organizations that receive funding under Title X are required to counsel and refer young adolescents on abortion. This implicitly sends the message to these youngsters that abortion is an acceptable method of family planning.

The merits of continued funding of the Title X program have long been questioned. It is estimated that one-third of the clients served through Title X funding are teen-agers.⁵² And yet, during the course of the 25 years of Title X's existence, the out-of-wedlock birth rate among girls aged 15-19 has increased 100 percent, the abortion rate for teens has more than doubled, and sexually transmitted diseases among teens also have increased.⁵³ Today, one out of every four sexually experienced teen-agers becomes infected with a sexually transmitted disease annually.⁵⁴

Family planning expenditures for all ages under Medicaid now approximate \$252 million annually,⁵⁵ and the annual appropriation to the Title X family planning program is now \$193 million,⁵⁶ one-third of which is expended on adolescents. The time is long overdue for the United States Congress to eliminate funding for such programs.

Similarly, the American taxpayer should not be forced to fund international family planning organizations that promote abortion overseas. The United States contributed \$50 million to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) alone for this year,⁵⁷ despite its involvement in China's coercive population-control program that includes forced abortions.⁵⁸ Amnesty International USA recently outlined some of the reports coming out of China regarding the method used to enforce its "one-child" policy:

[D]etainees were beaten and tortured to accelerate the payment of fines. Some were reportedly hung upside down, others received electric shocks on their tongue with electric batons or live wires-

One man who could not bear to see his wife tortured in a cell for days attempted to sell their children in Beijing- other women pregnant eight or nine months were given - against their will - injections to induce miscarriages.⁵⁹

In fiscal year 1993, the United States contributed at least \$580 million toward world family planning programs.⁶⁰ Any of this money that is contributed to organizations that encourage or perform abortions should be eliminated. Moreover, the entire budget should be reviewed to determine the success of the program to ensure that, like Title X, we are not subsidizing failed programs.

Encouraging Support of Private Charities

Enactment of legislation to enhance contributions to private charities as a first step toward transforming the bureaucratic welfare state into a system of private and faith-based compassion.

A 1994 report by the National Center for Policy Analysis details the growing evidence that private sector charities do a better job than government "of getting prompt aid to those who need it most, encouraging self-sufficiency and self-reliance, preserving the family unit and using resources [more] efficiently." 61 According to the same report, "94 percent of all shelters for the homeless in the U.S. are operated by private sector organizations." 62 Studies have shown that "as many as 80 percent of low-income people turn to the private sector first when facing a crisis." 63

In light of this evidence, as well as the growing evidence of the failure of government programs to discourage welfare dependency, the federal government should take steps to encourage donations to private charities which serve the needy.

In their Contract with America, House Republicans have enacted the most dramatic and sweeping welfare reform in decades. By turning welfare spending over to the states in the form of block grants, this reform will encourage innovation at the local level, promoting work and personal responsibility.

The *Contract with the American Family* takes the next step. We propose unleashing the charitable capacity of the American people by providing private, non-governmental solutions to the problems of the underclass. Through the Salvation Army and other private charities, millions of Americans will be able to provide compassionate assistance to those in need without sending more tax dollars to a failed, discredited bureaucratic welfare state.

Many citizens are not as generous in their contributions to private charitable organizations these days because they already are overtaxed. However, if given the choice between having their tax dollars subsidize government welfare programs or subsidize private charitable programs, many would prefer to designate the money to a private charity of their choice. Christian Coalition

urges the United States Congress to enact legislation to give taxpayers this opportunity.

One possible means to do so would be to allow individuals to designate on their income tax returns a limited amount of their taxes to qualified private charities. Another would be to create pilot programs through federal welfare block grants that earmark funding to encourage charitable giving and assistance to needy individuals through charities and religious organizations. For every dollar the taxpayer designates toward a private charity, the federal welfare funding to that taxpayer's state would be equally reduced.⁶⁴ As a result, "private charities would compete on an equal footing with government welfare programs for the portion of the federal budget that is allocated to poverty programs," thereby increasing competition. This will not only change government, it will change our citizenry's pattern of thinking - people will once again feel more of a civic duty toward their fellow man.

In the words of Acton Institute head Father Robert A. Sirico, "[G]overnment has no monopoly on compassion. Indeed, government is compassion's least able practitioner." Through a private charity check-off or other means, the 104th Congress can replace the welfare state with a culture of caring.

Restricting Pornography

Protecting children from exposure to pornography on the Internet and cable television, and from the sexual exploitation of child pornographers.

1. Enactment of legislation to protect children from being exposed to pornography on the Internet.

Pornography, both soft core and hard core, is freely available on the Internet to virtually anyone with a home computer. Several magazines post pornographic images that can be viewed by anyone, including children, for free. There are also numerous sites on the Internet where hard core pornography depicting a variety of explicit sexual acts, even rape scenes and bestiality, are available free and can be accessed with a few clicks of a computer button.

Christian Coalition urges Congress to enact legislation to protect children from being exposed to pornography on the Internet. Criminal law should be amended to prohibit distribution of, or making available, any pornography, soft core or hard, to children, and to prohibit distribution of obscene hard core pornography to adults.

2. Enactment of legislation to require cable television companies to completely block the video and audio on pornography channels to non-subscribers.

Many children throughout the country are exposed to pornography, often hard core, on cable television because of incomplete scrambling of the signal on pornography channels. Cable companies have asserted that it is the parents' responsibility to guard their children. Christian Coalition believes that the responsibility should be on the cable companies to help parents keep pornography out of their homes. Cable companies should not be allowed to transmit pornography to non-subscribers. We urge Congress to require cable television companies to completely block the video and audio on pornography channels to non-subscribers.

3. Amending the federal child pornography law to make illegal the possession of any child pornography.

Sexual exploitation of children through child pornography continues to be a major problem in society. Possession of child pornography should be a crime. President Reagan proposed such a law in 1988, hoping that those with collections of child pornography would destroy them for fear of federal prosecution. In an 11th hour compromise on the bill, however, a conference committee of House and Senate members changed the Reagan bill to criminalize only the possession of "three or more" items of child pornography, videos, magazines, etc. Thus, federal law sanctions the possession of some child pornography - less than three pieces. A person with two hour-long videotapes depicting the rape of a child cannot be charged with a federal crime, yet a person with three photos depicting a child in a lascivious pose can. Christian Coalition urges that the federal child pornography law should be amended to make illegal the possession of any child pornography.

Privatizing the Arts

The National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and Legal Services Corporation should become voluntary organizations funded through private contributions.

Christian Coalition urges the privatization of the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) because we do not view such funding as a proper role for the United States Government. The issue is not whether the arts should receive funding, but rather which entity should do so - the government or the private sector.

Through its grant selection process, the nea acts as an arbiter of art and places its endorsement or "seal of approval" on certain works. This federal imprimatur is as important to artists as is the funding which accompanies the grant. And yet, as William Bennett pointed out during his testimony calling for elimination of the nea, this role of arbiter itself should be questioned, as well as the "seal of approval" which gives the "official blessing - the blessing of the people of the United States - to things both worthy and horrible."⁶⁵ This federal endorsement is particularly objectionable when it applies to obscenity, pornography, or attacks on religion.

Despite repeated attempts by the United States Congress to place common-sense restrictions on federal funding of the arts, nea dollars continue to go toward controversial works that denigrate the religious beliefs and moral values of mainstream Americans.⁶⁶ William Donohue, president of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, has joined the call for de-funding the nea, stating: "We, as Catholics, have rights too, and among them is the right not to be defamed, and this is especially true when defamation is funded with government money."

At a time of fiscal restraint and budget austerity, cultural agencies cannot expect to be exempt from the broader realities of declining federal spending. Americans spend more than \$7 billion annually on the arts; only \$173 million is derived from federal funding. The privatization of the nea into a voluntary, charitable organization would unleash the creative capacity of the American

people and de-politicize one of the most controversial agencies in recent years. It is an idea whose time has come.

The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) also would be improved by privatization. Lynne Cheney, the NEH Chairman from 1986 to 1992, testified in January in support of ending federal funding for the agency. During her testimony she explained, "The humanities - like the arts - have become highly politicized. Many academics and artists now see their purpose not as revealing truth or beauty, but as achieving social and political transformation.

Government should not be funding those whose main interest is promoting an agenda."⁶⁷ The controversial national history standards, which NEH funding assisted in bringing into existence, are one such example.⁶⁸

William Bennett cites another example of the NEH's use of taxpayer dollars: "[T]he NEH provides funding for the Modern Language Association (MLA) - Their annual convention attracts over 10,000 professors and students and reveals the type of agenda that NEH grants make possible. Past panels include such topics as 'Lesbian Tongues Untied;' 'Henry James and Queer Performativity;' [and] 'Status of Gender and Feminism in Queer Theory;'"⁶⁹ It is clear that at a time when 24 percent of the average American family's budget goes to the federal government in taxes, we can find a better use for these tax dollars than through continued funding of the NEH.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) is another entity that should rely on private funding. Federal subsidies to the Public Broadcasting Service cost taxpayers \$350 million a year, an example of transfer payments from the middle-class to the well-to-do.

Children Television Workshop, producer of "Sesame Street," reaps more than \$100 million in licensing fees annually. Its chief executive officer earns \$647,000 annually in salary and benefits. A rate card sent out by Washington, D.C. PBS affiliate WETA in 1992 noted that the average net worth of its contributors was \$627,000; one in eight was a millionaire; one in seven owned a wine cellar; one in three had been to Europe in the previous three years.

Would privatization cause the death-knell of public broadcasting? Hardly. Private and corporate contributions already make up the vast majority of public broadcasting's revenue. Only 14 percent of the Public Broadcasting Service's (PBS) budget comes from the federal government, and only 3 percent of the National Public Radio's (NPR) budget is composed of federal funds.

Lastly, the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) is a federally chartered corporation established to provide legal assistance to the poor. It received an appropriation of \$415 million for FY 1995. What many Americans don't realize is that divorce proceedings are a high priority for many legal services grantees. 70 The LSC alone paid for 210,000 divorces in 1990, at an estimated cost to taxpayers of \$50 million. Yet, as study after study has revealed, divorce is not helping our nation's poor break out of poverty. Rather, as historian Barbara Dafoe Whitehead has pointed out: "Children in single-parent families are six times as likely to be poor. Twenty-two percent of children in one-parent families will experience poverty during childhood for seven years or more, as compared with only two percent of children in two-parent families." 71 Therefore, an agency that was established to help ameliorate poverty is instead fostering it through its financing of divorce actions.

Christian Coalition urges Congress to privatize all four entities, the NEA, NEH, CPB, and LSC, and turn them into organizations funded through private contributions.

Crime Victim Restitution

Funds given to states to build prisons should encourage work, study, and drug testing requirements for prisoners in state correctional facilities, as well as requiring restitution to victims subsequent to release.

Today's prisons are not designed either to punish convicts or provide justice to victims. In Pennsylvania, felons can receive in-cell cable TV. 72 At a facility in Fallsburg, New York, outdoor weight training areas feature televisions prisoners can view as they work out. 73 Hard labor has been replaced in many prisons with recreational activities.

Christian Coalition urges Congress to enact legislation that will encourage states to instill work and study requirements for prisoners. More than one million inmates are imprisoned in our country's correctional facilities - 919,143 in state prisons and 93,708 in federal prisons. 74 Although a majority of institutions have academic programs, many prisoners do not participate in them.

75 In fact, a 1990 census found that "[a]pproximately 570,000 inmates, accounting for two-thirds or more of both sexes in State and Federal facilities, were not participating in any academic activities." Moreover, about a third of the prison population had no work assignment, and 25 percent of the population was idle - meaning prisoners neither worked nor participated in an academic program.⁷⁶

An estimated 70 percent of inmates in U.S. prisons are functionally illiterate. Without the ability to read and write, these individuals are unable to find work outside prison, a contributing factor giving the United States one of the highest prison recidivism rates in the Western world. Literacy programs - many of which can be provided by private charities and prison ministries at low cost - will give prisoners hope and give society a better chance to absorb former inmates upon their release.

Moreover, with one out of four American households victimized by crime each year, as well as more than 700,000 days of hospitalization resulting from crime-related injuries, victim restitution is very necessary.⁷⁷ Requiring an offender to make restitution to the victim will not only force the offender to confront the consequences of his actions, but also compensate the victim monetarily.

Christian Coalition urges Congress to remedy this by conditioning the receipt of federal prison construction funding by the states on enactment of work and study requirements. Moreover, we urge that restitution to victims subsequent to release also be required.

Conclusion

The *Contract with the American Family* is the first word, not the last word, on a cultural agenda for the 104th Congress during the post-100-day period. The ideas included in this document are suggestions, not demands, and are designed to be a help, not a hindrance, to Members of Congress as they seek to fulfill their mandate for dramatic change.

Christian Coalition welcomes the support of Republicans and Democrats alike as it seeks passage of the items in this bold legislative agenda. There is no specified deadline on acting on the Contract. The Coalition and its grassroots members will work on behalf of these mainstream proposals in this Congress and in as many subsequent sessions of Congress as necessary to secure

passage.

The *Contract with the American Family* emerged from a survey of Christian Coalition members and supporters conducted in March and April, 1995. It has been improved during the drafting process by extensive polling and focus groups and consultations with members of Congress and their staffs. Each item in the Contract enjoys support from between 60 and 90 percent of the American people. More than half of the items in the Contract already have legislative sponsors, and several have already been passed by committee.

The American people now have a Congress that is receptive to their desire for religious liberty, stronger families, lower taxes, local control of education, and tougher laws against crime. With the *Contract with the American Family*, the nation now has an agenda with broad support that addresses time-honored values and cultural issues for the 104th Congress and beyond.

Endnotes

1. Ronald Brownstein, "Dissatisfied Public May Spell Democrat Losses," Los Angeles Times, July 28, 1994.
2. Nationwide survey by Luntz Research and Strategic Services, conducted February 11-12, 1995. Sample Size: 1000. Theoretical margin of sampling error: + or - 3.1%.
3. Keith A. Fournier, *Religious Cleansing in the American Republic*, 1993, p. 17. The decision was later reversed after counsel intervened.
4. Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, 1994 Catholic League's 1994 Report on Anti-Catholicism, p. 14.
5. Ibid.
6. Keith A. Fournier, *Religious Cleansing in the American Republic*, 1993, p. 16. In both instances, the children were allowed to read their Bibles after legal counsel intervened.
7. Only after the student's parent contacted the school board was the book allowed.
8. Mark Kellner, "Postal Grinch Who Stole Christmas," The Washington Times, November 20, 1994; Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, 1994 Catholic League's 1994 Report on Anti-Catholicism, p. 17.
9. Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, 1994 Catholic League's 1994 Report on Anti-Catholicism, p. 16.
10. 403 U.S. 602 (1971).
11. Jesse H. Choper, *The Establishment Clause and Aid to Parochial Schools* -

An Update, 75 Cal.L.Rev. 5, 6-7. (1987).

12. *Lamb's Chapel v. Center Moriches School Dist.*, 113 S.Ct. 2141, 2149 (1993) (Scalia, J., concurring).

13. William J. Bennett, *The Index of Leading Cultural Indicators* (March 1993), p. 17.

14. "[T]he U.S. spends a greater percentage of its gross national product on education (7.5%) than any other country except Israel, and yet is outperformed in math and science among 13-year-olds by more than 10 nations, including Hungary, Taiwan and the former Soviet Union." Claudia Wallis, "A Class of Their Own," *Time*, Oct. 31, 1994, 56

15. 140 Congressional Record S9917 (daily ed. July 27, 1994).

16. Maria Koklanaris, "Virginia parents may get option to exclude pupils from counseling," *The Washington Times*, Oct. 28, 1994.

17. U.S. Department of Education, *Strong Families, Strong Schools* (September 1994).

18. Pub. L. 103-227.

19. Pub. L. 103-382.

20. Claudia Wallis, "A Class of Their Own," *Time*, October 31, 1994, p. 56.

21. Claudia Wallis, "A Class of Their Own," *Time*, October 31, 1994, pp. 53, 56, citing a 1992 report by the Educational Testing Service.

22. Claudia Wallis, "A Class of Their Own," *Time*, October 31, 1994, pp. 53, 56.

23. Carol Innerst, "Education Still Lacking Bang for Buck," *The Washington Times*, September 21, 1994.

24. Family Research Council, "Freeing America's Schools[:] The Case Against the U.S. Education Department," *Family Policy*, p. 5.

25. Letter from Terrel Bell, to *The Washington Post*, February 1, 1995.

26. Carol Innerst, "Some Historians See New Standards as Revisionist Coup," *The Washington Times*, October 27, 1994.

27. Lynne V. Cheney, "The End of History," *The Wall Street Journal*, October 20, 1994.

28. Lynne V. Cheney, "The End of History," *The Wall Street Journal*, October 20, 1994.

29. *Ibid.*

30. See Congressional Record, S1025-1040, January 18, 1995.

31. Congressional Record, January 18, 1995, S1025-2040.

32. Statement of Senator Slade Gorton, Congressional Record, January 18, 1995, p. S1034.

33. U.S. Department of Education, Center for Choice in Education, Issue

- Brief, "Public Opinion on Choice in Education" (March 1992), Executive Summary.
34. The Heritage Foundation, "School Choice Continues to Gain Ground," *Business/Education Insider* (June/July 1994).
35. Statement of Senator Coats, *Congressional Record*, March 24, 1995, S4582.
36. *In re Sumey*, 94 Wash.2d 757, 621 P.2d 108 (1980).
37. *Matter of Ray*, 408 N.Y.S.2d 737 (1978).
38. K.L. Billingsley, "Sex, Lies and County Government: Abuse Case Shows It All," *The San Diego Union-Tribune*, July 19, 1992.
39. *Human Events*, February 24, 1995.
40. United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 16.
41. United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 13.
42. United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, Article 15.
43. Committee on the Rights of the Child, Eighth Session, Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties Under Article 44 of the Convention, p. 3.
44. Statement of Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, *Congressional Record*, January 26, 1995.
45. Mother Teresa of Calcutta, remarks at the National Prayer Breakfast, February 3, 1994.
46. Illustration Adapted from Drawings Appearing in the February 1993 Issue of "Life Advocate," *National Right to Life News*, July 14, 1993, p. 12.
47. Diane M. Gianelli, "Shock-tactic ads target late-term abortion procedure," *American Medical News*, July 5, 1993 (emphasis added to quotation).
48. Douglas Johnson, "AMA Newspaper Investigative Report Supports NRLC Statements on Brutal 'D&X' Abortion Method," *National Right to Life News*, July 14, 1993, pp. 12, 13.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
50. Douglas Johnson, "AMA Newspaper Investigative Report Supports NRLC Statements on Brutal 'D&X' Abortion Method," *National Right to Life News*, July 14, 1993, p. 12.
51. Diane M. Gianelli, "Shock-tactic ads target late-term abortion procedure," *American Medical News*, July 5, 1993.
52. Family Research Council, "Suffer the Children: Title X's Family Planning Failure," *Insight*, by Gracie S. Hsu; Family Research Council, "An Estimate of Federal Spending on Contraceptive-'Safe Sex' Services for Adolescents 1970-1993," *Insight*, by Charles A. Donovan, Sr., p. 2.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Ibid.*

55. Family Research Council, "An Estimate of Federal Spending on Contraceptive-'Safe Sex' Services for Adolescents 1970-1993," Insight, by Charles A. Donovan, Sr., p. 2.
56. H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 103-733, 103d Cong., 2d Sess. 64 (1994).
57. National Right to Life Committee, Inc. Memorandum, From Douglas Johnson, Legislative Director, to "Interested Parties," April 20, 1995, p. 2.
58. Ibid.
59. Amnesty International USA, "People's Republic of China[:] Catholic Villagers in Hebei Province," March 14, 1995.
60. National Right to Life Committee, Inc., "The Clinton Administration's Promotion of Abortion as a Tool of Population Control in Less-Developed Nations," June 1, 1994, page 2.
61. National Center for Policy Analysis, "Why Not Abolish the Welfare State?" (October 1994), Executive Summary.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid.
64. For a general discussion of this concept, see National Center for Policy Analysis, Why Not Abolish the Welfare State? (October 1994), p. 30.
65. Written Testimony of William J. Bennett, Before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, January 24, 1995, p.3.
66. Rod Dreher, "S&M 'Art' Video Exceeds Shocking Stage Version," The Washington Times, January 26, 1995.
67. Written Testimony of Lynne V. Cheney, Before the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee on January 24, 1995, p.1.
68. Congressional Record, January 18, 1995, S1025-40.
69. Written Testimony of William J. Bennett, Before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, January 24, 1995.
70. Kathleen B. DeBettencourt, Office of Policy Development, Legal Services Corporation, "Legal Services Corporation vs. The Family," March 1988, p. 15.
71. Barbara Dafoe Whitehead, "Dan Quayle Was Right," The Atlantic Monthly, April 1993, p. 47.
72. Robert James Bidinotto, "Must Our Prisons Be Resorts?" Reader's Digest, November, 1994, pp. 65, 76.
73. Robert James Bidinotto, "Must Our Prisons Be Resorts?" Reader's Digest, November, 1994, p. 65.
74. U.S. Department of Justice, "State and Federal Prison Population Tops One Million," October 27, 1994.
75. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1990," p. 11.

76. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, 1990," p. 12. A survey of state prison inmates in 1991 also substantiated that approximately one-third of the inmates had no work assignments. See Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Survey of State Prison Inmates, 1991," p. 27.

77. H.R. Rep. No. 104-16, 104th Congress, 1st Sess. at 4 (1995).



Suggested Donation: \$1.50

The Free American!

JUNE 1995

Support Our Constitution!

FEDERAL AGENCIES IMPLICATED IN OKC BOMBING



John Doe #2

THE FIVE STAGES OF GOVERNMENT TYRANNY

(1) Social Isolation of Target Group (TG).

(2) Public Vilification of TG.

(3) Outlawing Previously Legal Activities or Existence of TG.

(4) Arrest and Prosecution of TGs Whose Lifestyle or Existence is Now Illegal.

(5) Execution, Imprisonment, or Forced "Re-education" of TG.

See the story in the June Issue about Right Wing - Left Wing! Do you understand the lies told on this subject? Very simply explained!



Robert Rodriguez, (center) undercover ATF agent who tried to get bosses to call off the Waco Raid, was made scapegoat. He is now the first agent to ever sue the BATF. In this photo, taken by Bob Owen, run in Soldier of Fortune's June issue, Rodriguez is escorted into the Branch Davidian's trial in San Antonio by case agent Davy Aguilera and an unidentified agent who reportedly sat in the press section with a burp gun under his coat. With billions of dollars in lawsuits pending against the BATF over Waco, who had a motive to destroy most of the evidence about Waco being held at the Federal Building in OKC? Any resemblance here to John Does 1 and 2 or is it just my paranoia acting up again?

Order Now!

Help us bring this important story to the attention of the American people! Read about the Justice Department Official's Affidavit that implicates Janet Reno in the planning for this hideous crime! Help us break the strangle hold of the Major Media on the minds of our fellow citizens.

Buy copies of this Edition of The Free American and distribute them far and wide!

You need to read the story which will accompany these shocking pictures! Your friends, family, co-workers and neighbors need to read all of the information in The Free American! And not just this month, but every month! You can donate every month and have a number of copies available to ensure the widest possible distribution of The Truth!

Call for rates on 10, 25 or 50 copies delivered right to your door every month!

For this issue of The Free American:

100 copies; just \$45.00 Donation postage paid anywhere in the continental U.S.
50 copies just \$25.00 Donation postage paid!
25 copies just \$15.00 Donation postage paid!



Timothy McVeigh



John Doe #1

Carefully compare the pictures shown on this page and draw your own conclusions. Don't you think that Robert Rodriguez should be asked to identify the agent on the right? Do you think that this is going to happen? Not without a loud outcry from you, the people of this nation!

Send to:
THE FREE AMERICAN
C/O PO Box 2016
Tijeras, New Mexico
[PZ 87059]

For quantity discounts and advertising rates, call:
1-505-296-4415 or
FAX 1-505-292-5095

Checks, Gold, FRNs or MOs.
Sorry, no Credit Cards
Allow 4-6 weeks for delivery.
Help us, Help you!

Donate Now! We need your support to bring this important information to the people!

Published monthly. Recommended Donation for 12 Issues, just \$24.00!

Name _____ Address _____
City _____ State _____ Postal Zone _____

Stories in the June Edition:
Bomb: A detailed look at the device which was probably used in OKC.
Trust?: In the government? What a unique concept!

Fourteenth Amendment: A look at why the press covers up so much about this travesty of justice.
More on ZIP Codes!
NAFTA
Swiss Police, in America.

Flouridation
Corruption, in Washington.
Who owns the Postal Service?
Global 2000
Health, cartoons and much, much more!
Don't miss a single issue!

Why do we need a Federal Department of Education?

- Education needs a strong national voice. Anything less than a cabinet level position would undermine the importance of education on the national agenda.
- Acts as a focus for research and information on education in America. For example, ERIC serves 500,000 each year as a database for the latest education research.
- Ensures equitable access to education for all students. This is a vital function and must be monitored at the national level.
- Promotes greater access to higher education.
- 70% of student financial aid comes from the Federal government.
- Between 1958 and 1990, the ~~amount~~^{number} of students in post-secondary education quadrupled.
- From 1970 to 1990, minority enrollments in higher education have increased by 600%.
- Provides assistance to 10 million disadvantaged students who have problems reading and writing ^{leading to}
- Builds partnerships with states and communities to raise academic standards. This is done with the Goals 2000 program without imposing a single regulation on state and local governments.

Gunderson

- No proof that a massive reorganization would be cost-efficient. The proposed \$60 million/year in cost reduction (ED's share) would be offset by increased costs from dislocation and disruption of programs.
- By unifying education programs, the Department has already reduced its workforce a third even though its client population has increased. No more reduction in workforce is likely without cutting programs.
- Educational goals would be marginalized in favor of "workforce preparation." The emphasis on cognitive and social development in schools would not be in the mission of the merged Department.
- The two Departments have conflicting missions. Labor is concerned with workers in the workplace. ED is concerned with students in the classrooms. Labor is primarily a regulatory agency. ED has developed a de-regulatory culture, and promotes flexibility in the use of its funds.
- Any coordination necessary between Labor and ED is already being efficiently carried out. The School-to-Work program is an excellent example of this.

Freshmen

- Eliminating the Department would inefficiently scatter education programs across six agencies, creating havoc and inefficiency that is not currently present. One agency should be held accountable for the education programs.
- Splitting up the programs among six agencies also makes it more difficult on our clients, the states and localities that benefit from our services. They will have to construct new procedures for dealing with six agencies instead of working with the one agency they are used to now.
- The block grants proposed have no mechanism for accountability. How can we be sure taxpayers get their money spent on educational needs?

Why has staffing and S&E increased since we took over?

- The new Direct Student Loan program accounts for the increase in the S&E budget: with DSL, it's a 25% increase -- but if we don't include DSL, it's a 2% increase.
-

Block grants

- They don't save any money. The Department already functions at administrative costs of 2% of the budget. The only way they could save money is to cut education programs.
- No focus or accountability in block grants. Instead of targeting educational needs, the money could go towards non-educational expenditures (e.g., band uniforms or building maintenance).
- Professional development is the first thing to go in school budgeting, due to the lack of immediate measurable outcomes. Without money specifically targeted for professional development, its role in school reform will be negligible.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Why shouldn't the Departments of Education and Labor be merged?

The Departments of Education and Labor should not be merged because:

- 1) **Their missions are different.** ED's mission is education; DOL focuses on a variety of worker issues including workplace safety, unemployment compensation, and training, mainly for adults. The vast majority of the staff and budget of Labor has nothing to do with education. Mine-safety inspectors and elementary schools have nothing in common.
- 2) **Education and training are not the same thing, and their purposes are best served if the distinction is preserved.**
- 3) **In the search for efficiency and effectiveness, merging the two Departments would be counterproductive** by making a mega-bureaucracy with most functions unrelated.

These three reasons are discussed separately below.

1) The missions of the Departments of Education and Labor are very different and both very important.

In the arena of training, where there is commonality, education and training policy and programs should be closely coordinated. In fact, the Administration itself has moved in this direction through its School-to-Work initiative and in the Administration's new proposals for youth and adult workforce training.

However, most of what the Department of Labor does is unrelated to training.

- For example, of DOL's \$34 billion budget, only about \$7 billion is for the administration of employment and training programs.
- Two-thirds of DOL's budget goes to unemployment insurance, pensions and other programs totally unrelated to education and training.
- Of DOL's 17,000 staff, less than 2,000 work on employment and training issues. The remainder work on worker health and safety, enforcement of minimum wage and hour laws, laws relating to conditions in and changing needs of the workplace, labor statistics, and income-maintenance programs mentioned above.

The Department of Education's goals and the populations it serves are far broader than those of workplace training.

- The main mission of the Department of Education is to ensure educational excellence and equity. Department priorities focus on building a solid base of academics and other knowledge and skills for learners of all ages. While of course this should improve worker performance in the long run, training in narrow workplace skills is not ED's mission.
- Of ED's \$31 billion budget, by far the biggest expenditures are for programs to improve access and achievement among educationally disadvantaged populations from the primary through the postsecondary levels. The Department focuses on students in educational institutions and settings across the country.

All of our major international competitors have separate Departments, Ministries, or Councils of Education (and among all developed nations, to our knowledge only Australia has combined the functions of Labor and Education; the consolidation was accompanied by a substantial budget increase, not a reduction).

In summary, consolidation of the two U.S. departments would merge two organizations with very different missions and would symbolically de-emphasize the importance of education at a time when educational improvement is critical for the United States.

2) There is a fundamental difference between education and training.

Education is defined as the development of a person's knowledge, skill, mind, and character. It involves expanding the mind; in essence, education is learning to learn. Education is a foundation not only for work, but for all aspects of life.

Training, on the other hand is "to instruct so as to make proficient or qualified."¹ Training prepares a person for a specific job.

Not only are education and training not the same thing, in some cases they may conflict.

- For example, an employer may have an immediate need for someone trained as a machine tool operator. Because education and training are expensive, there is a strong short-term incentive to train as narrowly and quickly as possible. Yet in the long run, the best employee--the one who helps the employer increase productivity, the one who eventually becomes an excellent team leader and idea generator--may well be the

¹ Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language

person who learned to analyze problems and communicate with others through a sound and broad basic education, not the person with the ability to run the machine according to the training manual. Merging education and training will make it more likely that the short-term incentives will win out over the longer term good of both the economy and the individual.

Through education, we promote human development as well as economic development. In a democratic society, our purpose in investing in education goes beyond the need to turn out productive workers. Societies can instill in their citizens certain facts and skills so that they can be economically productive--but that isn't our vision of a good society or an educated citizenry. Through education, we believe we can foster personal growth, creativity, and qualities like responsibility and mutual respect that are required for a democratic society and self-sufficiency.

3) Consolidating all of education and labor programs in one Department likely would produce limited savings, if any, and would decrease efficiency and effectiveness.

You don't need to create a mega-Department to integrate overlapping programs or to coordinate programs with related purposes when most of the functions are unrelated (e.g., OSHA enforcement in Labor vs. research on how to improve student math achievement in Education). Integration and coordination are underway.

- In the few areas where ED and DOL programs are closely related today, such as in the School-to-Work area, we are already coordinating very closely and effectively.
- Further, as part of the GI Bill for America's Workers, the Administration has proposed integrating some 70 programs into a few flexible state grants for education and training for youth and adults, with very close coordination between the two federal agencies and their partners in states and communities around the country.
- We believe that examining all programs for effectiveness--integrating or eliminating those that are duplicative and coordinating others that are related--can result in increased efficiency and effectiveness. (Of course, many of the programs on the GAO list are widely recognized not to be "training" programs and not to be duplicative; for example, Even Start family literacy and the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit.)

The proposal to merge the two Departments, on the other hand, could create a megabureaucracy that would actually decrease accountability and efficiency.

- Bigger isn't necessarily better. For a time, Education was an office within a larger department. This was not an efficient arrangement and involved more employees.

- **The country has more of a focus on education with a separate Cabinet-level agency.** Since 1980, the National Education Goals have been adopted and the country has narrowed the gap between minority and majority student achievement. Test scores are generally up, and dropout rates are down. Citizens across the country have become increasingly aware of the need to improve education in America.

Massive reorganization would distract attention from the important task of improving education. There is considerable enthusiasm and energy in states, communities, and schools today to make educational improvements and to take advantage of the resources of reform consistent with Goals 2000, ESEA, and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. For example, in a sample of 8 states, 4 times as many communities applied for Goals 2000 funds to build local partnerships and start school reforms as there is money available. Reorganizing today at the federal level could well set back the clock in all of those areas. Maintaining a spotlight on education will facilitate the country's progress in this central area.