DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 985 FL 022 111

TITLE	The Educational Implications of NAFTA.
SPONS AGENCY	United States Coalition for Education for All, Arlington, VA.
PUB DATE	14 Jan 94
NOTE	34p.; Edited transcript of a symposium sponsored by the United States Coalition for Education for All (USCEFA).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *International Trade; Language Skills; Migrant Education; Partnerships in Education; Public Policy; Second Languages; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	European Community; *North American Free Trade Agreement

ABSTRACT

The transcript provided in this document is from a symposium set up to explore the educational implications of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). NAFTA, which will remove trade barriers between the United States, Mexico, and Canada contains no educational provisions. The panelists discuss the new educational challenges that NAFTA may create and look at ways to maximize the effectiveness of this new situation for education. Panelists include the following: Jonathan Davidson, Head of Academic Affairs, European Community Delegation; Peter Stephens, Assistant Academic Relations Officer, the Canadian Embassy; Eugene Garcia, Director of the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages, U.S. Department of Education; Ramon Ruiz, Deputy Director, Office of Migrant Education, U.S. Department of Education; Mauro Reyna, Consultant, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory; and Gregorio Luke, Deputy Director, Mexican Cultural Institute. A question and answer session concludes the transcript. (JL)

THE EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF NAFTA

AN EDITED TRANSCRIPT OF A SYMPOSIUM SPONSORED BY THE UNITED STATES COALITION FOR EDUCATION FOR ALL (USCEFA)

January 14, 1994
Washington, D.C.

THE EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF NAFTA

OPENING REMARKS

Good morning, and welcome to all of you. I am Mary Fontaine, Executive Director of the United State Coalition for Education for All--otherwise known as USCEFA. The Coalition is a national, nonprofit organization that works to bridge domestic and international education. We do this in part by providing domestic educators with information about issues, ideas and innovations around the world. We believe that global developments in education have great relevance for us here at home and that by cooperating--by "internationalizing" the field of education in this country--we can all benefit.

We are here today to explore the educational implications of the North American Free Trade Agreement. The NAFTA pact, which will remove trade barriers between the United States, Mexico and Canada, contains no educational provisions. But will it impact education? Many of us believe that it may create new challenges and new opportunities for education. We're here today to take a look at some of these issues and to find out how we can maximize the effectiveness of this new relationship for education.

I would like to introduce our panelists now and thank them all for being here.

JONATHAN DAVIDSON, HEAD OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, EUROPEAN COMMUNITY DELEGATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you very much, Mary. Before I begin, I ought to clarify, since there's quite a bit of confusion about our name these days, whether we're called the "European Community" or the "European Union." If you want to be sure of getting it right, you could call us the "European Communion."

When Mary first asked me to join this panel, I was a bit reluctant for several reasons. First, the differences are so great between NAFTA and the EC or EU, and, second, I'm not sure that the EU is, in any case, in a position to teach anybody about anything in its present state. Also, unlike my distinguished colleagues on this panel, I'm not an education expert despite the title of my job. So I ought to begin by saying all those things.

But Mary did very persuasively convince me to take part today, and on reflection I think she is right. There are some lessons to be drawn from the European experience. When I mentioned this forum to the people in Brussels who run our education programs, they thought, too, that there were some parallels to share with NAFTA in light of their own experience. And incidentally, they mentioned that there is a round table coming up with Canada which Peter Stephens might want to talk about.

Let me begin by just saying a little bit about those differences that Mary and I talked about because it is important to have one's focus clear in this regard. There are some fundamental constitutional distinctions. NAFTA is a free trade area, period. The European Union is a quasi-government. It has law making authority; it has supra-national institutions, central institutions with the power to tell the governments and member states what to do; it has a system of courts and enforcement; it has a set of common policies; it has a set of binding laws which take precedence over national laws--it's got all of those things which are appurtenances of governments even though it isn't, strictly speaking, either a federation or a government.

And then on the economic level, it's helpful to think in terms of about four steps on the ladder of economic integration. You can start with step one, the loosest form of economic integration, which is a free-trade area. The second step on the ladder is a customs union where you abolish tariffs and have one external tariff wall. The third level of intensity of integration would be a common or a single market whereby the factors of production--goods, services, people, capital--can move freely with no frontier barriers or controls. And the fourth level, complete economic integration, is a full economic and monetary union.

The EU has already completed the first three phases of those levels of integration and is now on the road to the fourth--full economic and monetary union. NAFTA doesn't have any aspirations to be anything other than a free-trade area, level one of integration, so it's a very loose form of integration in complete contrast to the EU, which from the outset, from the very beginning, had aspirations for political and full economic union. It isn't simply that we've drifted into these things. These were the aspirations of the founding fathers. They haven't been achieved without a great deal of debate and dissent along the way, but, nevertheless, this was the blueprint from the outset. So it is a fundamentally different model we're talking about here, and anything I say about our educational experience I think needs to be seen in the light of that fundamental distinction.

Now, because the EC didn't, in its founding treaties, have any competence for education, in this respect you might say we are similar to NAFTA. It hasn't stopped the EC from developing an alphabet soup of programs in the educational arena, so the very first lesson might be not to let the lack of statutory competence stand in your way. For a whole variety of reasons, education has crept onto the agenda of the EC, and it now does have full statutory competence in the Maastricht Treaty, which has just been implemented. There is a whole article on education and training programs, so now we're free to go with the full blessings of the treaty and further develop the programs that have already been established.

These programs address two of the central features of the Community. One is free movement of labor, free movement of people generally. It's integral, always has been integral to the concept of the EU, that there shall be free movement of people. Well, it doesn't make much sense to strive for the full freedom of people to move wherever they want and live and settle and work wherever they want within the Community if you don't at the same time make vigorous strides to do all sorts of things in the area of training and education--perfectly obvious. So a major thrust of our programs is addressing the need to equip this goal of free movement of people with the necessary programs and support from the Community as a whole.

But then secondly, there's another central feature of the EC which has always been apparent from the very beginning. This is the effort to, if you like, iron out the economic disparities between our different members. Now they're not as great, of course, as the disparities between Mexico and her northern neighbors in terms of economic development, but nevertheless, there are some very considerable disparities among the member states of the EC, and particularly, of course, when we took in the southern members--Spain, Portugal, and Greece--in the '80s. There are some parallels there in the relationship between those countries and the rest of the EU and Mexico and her northern

neighbors. But where we have a different approach in Europe is that it's a very central feature of the European Community, always has been, to indulge in massive resource transfers to redress those economic disparities. There are so-called structural funds for really large-scale resource transfers, and a hefty chunk of the structural funds is devoted to education and training to redress some of the disparities in educational resources available in the poorer states. So it's always been available to the Community to deploy these resource, particularly in the area of training, vocational training and worker retraining. As industries are phased out and technological change gathers pace, so the Community has moved in with programs to help workers to adjust and retrain. Those programs have always been on the books.

It is also an important component of the European Union to begin to help foster the notion of "European consciousness" and to develop the notion of European citizenship, which now is a fact with the Maastricht Treaty, and also, of course, to develop language skills.

Contrary to what a lot of people in this country think, we are not developing a single language in Europe. We're developing a lot of other "single" things, but we're not developing a single language. Language diversity is a fact of life. It's always going to be a fact of life, and the EU exists to promote, to cherish, to nurture language diversity--we're a real Tower of Babel in the Commission in Brussels. We operate in nine official languages, and we have language programs, teaching programs, with all sorts of facets to them that boost the training, the teaching of languages. I think there are 11 official languages in the LINGUA Program.

In terms of student mobility, student exchange, faculty exchange, institutional linkages, that's what ERASMUS exists for; and in terms of technical training, advanced technology particularly, to help equip Europe for global competitiveness, which is a major concern, that's why the COMET family of programs exists, to develop the relationships particularly between business and academia, to help technological training.

Now all of these things, particularly that latter--advanced technology training, plus vocational training, plus worker retraining, these were very much on the agenda of the Summit that President Clinton had on Tuesday this week with our President DeLors and the President of the Council, Papandreou of Greece. At the top of the agenda in that meeting on Tuesday--they had a Summit immediately after the NATO Summit--were these issues that we've just been talking about. So it's very much on the agenda, not only within Europe but trans-Atlantic, and it will be a feature of the Jobs Conference in March that President Clinton called. The Job Summit is I think officially called the Jobs

Conference now.

Investment in training and education is right at the top of the agenda in that arena. It's at the top of the agenda in the European Summit, too, and the summit leaders in Europe sat down in December to address the unemployment crisis in Europe--11% unemployment. Again, investment in training for the long-term, investment in human resource development, is one of the items at the top of the agenda, and that whole issue--growth, competitiveness, unemployment--is at the very top the European agenda right now. And that's why it dominated, in fact I think exclusively, that particular Summit.

Just a word about relations with neighbors because that's perhaps more relevant than anything else--relations with neighbors in the educational domain. In the new treaty, the Maastricht Treaty, Article 126 specifically provides for and gives us authority now to develop cooperative programs with third countries. And so programs like ERASMUS, LINGUA, COMET, the ones I mentioned, plus PETRA, those are all now offered to EFTA, to our neighbors in Western Europe who are beginning to join the European Union in one way or another. Those models are also used in Central and Eastern Europe for technical assistance programs. The ERASMUS and COMET models, particularly, are now available through TEMPUS. (We're wonderful at developing acronyms. I think there's a whole unit in Brussels that does nothing else but invent them.) Those programs, the TEMPUS family, are fairly well funded under the billion-dollar total technical assistance program for Central and Eastern Europe.

And then finally, lest we be accused of building a "Fortress Europe," I should mention that there is a mini-pilot program of EC-US cooperation in education which was launched last year. It's small-scale--a million dollars on each side--but at least it's a start, and we certainly hope to develop that program because there's a great deal that we can all learn from each other. There's a great deal to be done in the area of interchange, exchange, and trying to improve mobility of qualifications, mutual recognition of degrees and diplomas, that kind of thing, on which a lot of work has been done in Europe. I don't have time to go into it, but it's another whole area of activity that we've been involved in. This is just a very brief sketch of what we're about in Europe.

How much of it is relevant to NAFTA I leave to you to decide. But certainly there's a great willingness in Brussels, in the Task Force on Education, Human Resources and Youth (which is the cumbersome name of the department that runs these programs--it's a kind of embryonic Ministry of Education in Brussels), there's certainly great willingness to share their experience with any who are interested.

I guess I should leave you with two final acronyms. A lot of those programs are now being rolled into two new ones which are going to be called SOCRATES and, I think, LEONARDO. The education programs are going to be consolidated, greatly expanded, if the Council of Ministers agrees, into SOCRATES, and the training programs into LEONARDO, also greatly expanded, about doubled in budget size. If the Council of Ministers goes along, that's the plan for the next 5 years.

Thank you very much.

PETER STEPHENS, ASSISTANT ACADEMIC RELATIONS OFFICER, THE CANADIAN EMBASSY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

This is a very hard act to follow--Socrates and Leonardo DaVinci.

Bonjour. I'm Peter Stephens from the Canadian Embassy. I think rather than talk about the nuts and bolts of this--we can do that during the Q & A--I think right now I'll talk about some of the theory that's gone into the Canadian position. There are some new words, also, that I'm sure we've all heard. There's the "new trilateralism," there's the "new educational agenda," and there's a "new world view."

Previously, the strength of a nation was measured during the enforced peace of a cold war by military advantage. We talked about things like "throw weight," we talked about "MIRV's," we talked about "sea-based launched ballistic missiles," "nuclear missiles." We talked about "strategic and tactical advantage," and these were the working terms that we used in government and in foreign affairs...these were the things that occupied our daily lives.

More recently, during the 1980s, we measured national prowess in terms of GDP--rates of inflation, consumer spending, cycles of boom and bust, or as we politely call them, growth and constriction. Today, however, in the post-NAFTA environment, we're becoming increasingly aware that the true strength of a nation is measured by its people and their intellectual abilities.

The commitment of the Canadian Government in responsibility and in joint jurisdiction--and this is something that's a little different from the European Community, with our Provincial Ministries of Education--is to develop an intellectual regime that will create institutions and an atmosphere for lifelong learning. Trilateralism is a model, in part based on the European Community's ERASMUS project, and it seeks to do the following: We seek to create a 360-million people strong regional educational environment where new structures will encourage the free exchange of ideas, where students and professors will have unimpinged mobility, that is, between universities in Mexico, universities in Canada, and universities in the United States, where credits are comparable, and importantly, transferable. Obviously, what follows is the mobility of students. So students can take courses in Mexico, in Canada, or the United States and go towards a degree. The degree study program that we're trying to create in conjunction with USIA is a North American Studies Program. Very simply and very briefly, what a North American Studies Program would do would be to empower citizens of Canada, the United States and Mexico to

not only engage in the trade that we have set up under NAFTA, but to engage in a sense of developing regionalism. Now this is not building a bloc--we're not looking to create a customs union to exclude anyone. What we're looking to do is to forge a greater sense of regional identity, and we think that with the Canadian Government, in conjunction with our Provincial Ministries of Education and with the Mexican Ministries of Education and USIA, we'll be able to do that. That's the theory. I think I'll stop for now, and I'll be happy to discuss the nuts and bolts of this--who's paying for what, who's going where, where the system is heading and how we're hoping to set it up during the Q & A.

Thank you very much.

EUGENE GARCIA, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Gracias. Buenos días. Good to be here with you today. I do have a text this morning, but I'll try to keep it brief to deal with some of your questions during the Q & A. That text has to do with issues of bilingual education and its relationship primarily to Mexico, although we don't want to exclude our relationship with Canada as well in these areas.

But as you all know, a text without a context is a pretext, so I come here not with any pretext. I'm going to talk a little bit about the context of this work of bilingual education and NAFTA because I think understanding the context helps us understand what I will talk very briefly about as the text. What actually are we planning to do? What can we do?

There are several relevant contexts I want to speak to. One I would call the educational context of NAFTA, and what is already going on. And I want to put that, of course, into the general notion of educational reform.

The United States, for the last decade, has been talking about educational reform. To no surprise, so has Mexico. How can we better deal with issues that confront us as a society through the institutions we call schools? Bear with me because I am an educator. I am someone who writes about, thinks about, and tries to do something about what we actually do in schools. And the reform agenda in both countries, probably around the world, has centered around the notion that we are no longer interested in educating children to memorize and regurgitate information. Now, this is critical because this is a theoretical context for educational reform. In both Mexico and the United States we are interested now in identifying ways in which our schools can create a new generation of thinkers, or problem-solvers, of creators, not just of individuals who can tell you the weight of the moon and get that correct on the SAT test. So that is an essential theoretical presupposition that has guided reform across the boundaries, the borders.

It also has particular kinds of practice implications for education. First, we have new curriculum; we cannot depend on the old "memorize and regurgitate" curriculum. We must in fact deal with better trained professionals, both at the elementary and secondary level, and even at the preschool level, all the way through the universities. Those are key ingredients--not just theories--to implementing educational reform, both in the U.S. and Mexico. Most importantly, this challenging education must be available to all students. Now, that's critical because in this country we have continued to argue for and to structure education

around a compensatory model--to believe that those children who are somehow disadvantaged need compensatory education which, both in the U.S. and Mexico, unfortunately has delivered essentially unchallenging kinds of curriculum and instruction. So together with the context of our working with Mexico and Canada, we must understand the context that education is in today. We are not about doing what we were doing 10 or 15 years ago. This is a new world in terms of what we expect out of our educational institutions.

This is particularly true in the bilingual education area and the service of education to all students. We do not wish in this country to just give people who enter our schools English; we wish to give them the highest challenging instruction and curriculum possible. Mexico agrees, Canada agrees, and we must move forward within that context.

Politically, NAFTA signals to us in education the opportunity to collaborate across boundaries which was previously prohibited. This is not to suggest that we weren't collaborating. A recent study suggests that there are numerous state and local activities which bring together the educational professions on both sides of the border, particularly U.S. and Mexico. And so we have, in fact, been collaborating. What NAFTA does is allow us politically, then, to move on and create a new context for that collaboration, a formal, official context that allows us to move ahead with educational reform.

The text, then, if that is the context: In recent meetings that I've had in Mexico and that our Secretary of Education has had w th the Secretary in Mexico, we have identified a set of collaborative activities. Our frustration coming into a new administration, and my specific frustration, is that we've always seemed to have a lot of meetings, but nothing ever seemed to happen at the national level. NAFTA now provides a mechanism, a vehicle, that I think should help us move in a number of different directions.

Specific to the Office of Bilingual Education, there are three initiatives that we're planning--a meeting in Los Angeles in the middle of February will lay some sort of muscle and sinew to the bones of these three different participatory, collaborative areas. One is curriculum development and sharing. As I said, Mexico is very interested in curriculum reform. In fact, they've just revised their entire curriculum, and we need to be part of that curriculum reform just as they need to be a part of our efforts in this country, including movements and technology for curriculum reform and development.

A second area is what we call instructional personnel exchanges. We have a couple going on now in the United States, and we want to see more of them. As you know, most of the action in schools

takes place in classrooms. We need to have Mexican instructors and U.S. instructors share their classroom activities, so we're looking for initiatives, specific initiatives in instructional personnel exchanges, starting with teacher exchanges.

The third area is joint training activities. The U.S. and Mexico, again in the area of educational reform, realize that we need a new cadre of trained educational professionals to implement our reform theories and notions. That means in the case of bilingual education that we can do joint training because bilingual education and linguistic diversity--a linguistically diverse population--are important, including the instruction of English as a second language. So again, we see a nice joint training opportunity activity that can, in fact, be nurtured and supported under the guise of NAFTA.

Now to be quite frank with you, we would probably have moved ahead anyway in these areas because the two agendas of Mexico and the U.S. are in fact in sync. But with NAFTA, we'll likely move faster and more formally than we were moving before.

In short, those are plans that we have. What are the vulnerabilities? What might stop us from doing this work under NAFTA? One, in our own education code, specifically as it relates to our new elementary and secondary education efforts, we are prohibited from using dollars to do international work. We have proposed to Congress that we be allowed, with the $10 billion that we invest in K-12 education, to use some of those dollars for international activities. So that is one of the vulnerabilities in saying we're going to do all this work--we can't apply our resources to it.

The other, quite frankly, is that with our work in Mexico, we might forget our colleagues in Canada. I think it's very important that we see a trilateral activity here in education. Our work in the bilingual education area has primarily focused in work with Mexico. I think we will need to rethink our position in looking at work that we can do with Canada.

In closing, there is a scholar who wrote about the importance of working with Mexico some 40 years ago by the name of George I. Sanchez, a Professor at the Univ. of Texas at Austin. Regarding work with Mexico and the education of children, particularly Mexican-American children in the U.S., he said, "We must do things right, but we must also do the right things." We've been trying to do the right things. What NAFTA does is begin to allow us to do the things right. Thank you.

RAMON RUIZ, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MIGRANT EDUCATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mary, thank you very much, and, *¿cómo están Uds. por la mañana? Comment allez vous?*

Dr. García pretty well described where we're coming from in the Department of Education. With respect to "migrant education," our interaction with Mexico started back when Dr. Cavasos was the U.S. Secretary of Education. He signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Sr. Días, who was Secretary of Education for Mexico at the time, and that enabled us to get more involved in integral activities for migrants, especially those from Mexico. As a result of that Memorandum, we held a border conference in El Paso, attended by educators from both countries. Lamar Alexander followed through on the conference agreements, and, as a result we were able to undertake many of the activities that Dr. García described, especially in migrant education.

Migrant education has been around for a long time, and as most of you know, or don't know, two out of the three migrant students in the U.S. are from Mexico. So, therefore, we have a lot of interest in working with them. Currently, we have a program, not at the national level, but from state to state, of credit exchange and approval, and we're working with 11 states from Mexico and 4 states from the U.S., especially California. California gets about 26,000 migrant children from Mexico every year, youngsters who move back and forth across the border, and we're able to give them credit for the work that they do both in the U.S. and in Mexico.

In some states in Mexico, children who are not in the country at the time school starts are not allowed to enroll in the middle of the semester. Because of our cooperative work with Mexico, we are able to ensure that those young people can be accepted upon their return and given credit for the work they accomplished in the U.S.

We also have college programs that help young people from Mexico graduate from college and go on into professional careers. Unfortunately, many of them--perhaps because of their difficult education circumstances--do not want to enter the education profession. They may become doctors, dentists, engineers, and the like, but it's hard to get them into the teaching professions.

But getting back to some of the agreements that we have: in the migrant program we have teacher exchanges, for instance, to assist "pocket migrants"--those groups of people who migrate from a community in Mexico to a part of South Carolina or California

to harvest a crop and then return to Mexico. Sometimes they bring their teachers with them. But in the summer, we send some of our teachers to work with them.

So we are already cooperating with Mexico. But we're not doing as much as we could with Mexico or Canada. We do get some migrants from Canada, especially those who move into Maine and Vermont, but not as many as we get from Mexico.

As we look at NAFTA, it is clear that we were left at home plate as far as education is concerned. The expectation is that, because of the free trade agreement, the quality of life in Mexico will improve. But the Department of Education does not have a policy as far NAFTA is concerned. Hopefully, we'll get into a position where we can develop a policy that will enable us to do what our colleagues in Europe are doing, with both Mexico and Canada.

Last April, the University of Arizona hosted a meeting with the Latino Educators Committee on Free Trade and Education, whose greatest concern was whether or not we would be able to convene a tri-national commission to arm the things that we're talking about--reciprocal credentials for teachers, school credit and accrual among the three countries, and so on.

I wasn't aware that Canada was working with USIA--that's how difficult communication is. And we're just right across the street. Hopefully, we can start talking to USIA, start talking to our neighbors from Canada, and see if we can come up with some kind of mechanism that enables us to implement the kinds of programs that our partners from Canada are talking about.

Dr. Garcia has pretty well articulated what it is that we want. We're hoping that the re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ASEA) and the Goals 2000 program will be vehicles to create an educated workforce, through teaching and high educational standards, by the year 2000. We have a lot of information on training exchanges, and I'll be glad to answer questions about those efforts, especially as they relate to migrant education, during the Q and A.

Thank you very much.

DR. MAURO REYNA, CONSULTANT, SOUTHWEST EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY, AUSTIN, TEXAS

Posiblemente Uds. me van a escuchar esta mañana y me van a entender lo que les estoy diciendo. Si me están entendiendo lo que estoy diciendo, por favor, levanten su mano. All eight of you. Basically, what I'm trying to impress upon you is that you have a population along the border from Brownsville, Texas, all the way to San Diego, California, that speaks the language with which I just opened my remarks. Oddly enough, the teachers along these borders do not speak the language that these youngsters bring to school.

Similarly, we have only four or five lakes that separate the United States from Canada, and then we have a line, somewhere, from there to the state of Washington.

I was born and raised in South Texas, and on my first day of school I was sent home with tape across my mouth because I could not speak English. That's not too many years ago, by the way. So my remarks come to you from a person who has experienced a bit of what you read about in different magazine and journal articles that begin, "Research says...."

Let me show you a picture in a document you have in your folder. This is a document that I just read last week when it was published by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

By the way, I'd like to ask Preston Kronkowski to raise his hand. Preston is the President and the Chief Executive Officer of what we call the Southwest Lab.

If you look at page 13, you'll see what looks like a lake with a lot of little cabins around it. But it is not a lake with a lot of little cabins. It is what we call a "colonia" in Mexico, right across the border, and these "cabins" are the homes where families live today. Landlords have sold these shacks to people for $100 down and maybe $15 or $20 a month after they come back from the migrant streams that Ramón was talking about. They have no utilities whatsoever.

It kind of angers me, after having spent 35 years in education, that I must keep returning to the same battles that we fight, either in Congress or at the state level, year after year.

Recently, I had the good fortune to visit with about 17-20 school superintendents from the tip of Texas in Brownsville--if you can envision the map of the State of Texas--all the way to El Paso. And I asked them, "What is NAFTA?" School superintendents, in this area--God bless them--they don't have the time to sit down and find out what NAFTA is, and they told me so. They said,

"Mauro, we just don't have the time to get into that."
I visited with university presidents up and down the border, and I heard the same thing. "We've heard about it, but we don't know that much about it to really get into a discussion."

Last week, I was given permission by the Lab to go to El Paso and talk to the *Directora* from a school in Juarez. I can't go, as Dr. García says, to Juárez in Mexico and even pay 25 or 50 cents to cross that border and bring back a receipt for Preston to reimburse me. I can't do that. So I got her to come over, and I paid for her lunch. We talked for about four hours. They are desperately in need of teaching materials, textbooks and improved schooling conditions.

For many years, education was really governed by the national government in Mexico. Now it's the responsibility of the state governments, which I think is better. Now people in Texas don't have the excuse of saying, "We can't go all the way to Mexico City to discuss educational issues." But they can go to the state capitals in Monterrey, or in Mogollón, in Santillo, or in Juárez and Chihuahua and so on. There shouldn't be any excuse anymore.

Many of the youngsters we are teaching along the U.S.-Mexican border today commute on a daily basis from Mexico to the United States, or, for all practical purposes, lived in Mexico 4 or 5 years ago, or less. Bilingual education, as Dr. García and the *Directora* I mentioned earlier explained, is essential because we want to be able to communicate with these youngsters who come to our schools. "You teach 'em where they're at"--have your heard that before? I'm sure that you who work in education have. But if you don't have a command of their language, how can you do that?
In Mexico, the *Directora* says, bilingual education is no longer a luxury. They consider it a necessity in order to survive, especially along the *frontera*. So what do **we** do then? We expect the teachers in Mexico to teach the youngsters English, but we don't teach our students or teachers Spanish, and she's the first one to criticize that.

She also says that Mexico needs some help in teacher training. In El Paso, a great, fantastic technology center is not being used as much as it should be. Why not bring people from Juárez and teach them about computer literacy there? Why can't we do that? Well, we just can't. Why? Because we've never done it before. God bless the bureaucrats. But let's get out of this business of having an excuse not to do things just because we've never done them before! Let's just do them!

Here's an interesting fact about the dropout rate we all talk about: in Juárez today the highest dropout rate is among teachers. Why teachers? The *maquiladoras*, the Twin Plant

Industry, is recruiting teachers to work as technicians so they can train other workers.

The other dropouts are students who are going to secondary school--the *secundarias*--those in grades, let's say, 6 though 10. Why? Because they are able to at least read and write in Spanish and so have access to jobs.

What has that brought about? A fantastic social revolution where mothers and daughters are working outside of the home. That's a complete change from the way it used to be. The man in Mexico along the border now depends on his wife and children to bring in the money. So imagine what that does to the family situation.

Many years ago, teachers from Mexico, fully certified, could not teach in the United States...at least in Texas they couldn't. But now that law has been changed, and a teacher from Mexico can teach in Texas but has to have taken courses in Texas history and Texas government. I had to take them both in order to get my license to teach. So when I hear about the possibility of transferring credits from one country to another, I know that we still can't do that easily, even between Texas and Mexico. Something has to be done to simplify this process.

When Ramón talks about migrant education and the movement of families, I know what he's talking about. I've worked with migrant students and such families from South Texas all the way to the Yakima Valley in Washington state through the fields in Michigan, and we must find ways to better accommodate them and integrate them into our educational system.

The school enrollment in Texas is rising at over 16% along the border, which is double the statewide average! One out of every four new students in Texas is coming from Mexico! And one out of every four will drop out. There is a critical need for the special ESL and bilingual education programs that Dr. García is working to provide for us.

And what about facilities? Where do we house these people? I was in a Texas school district about 5 or 6 weeks ago, and the Superintendent told me that they get about 2,000 students from Mexico each year. That's the equivalent of one entire elementary school. How can they build schools to accommodate these students? They're "maxed out" with property taxes, and we don't have a state income tax in Texas. So we must have some kind of a system that brings about necessary teacher training and essential exchanges of teachers and students to equalize education, at a high level, between the two countries.

Along with the background material that Mary sent me, she asked if I had heard about "Hands Across the Border." Yes, I have. When I was in Isleta as a school Superintendent, we initiated

that program. All the work was done by business people--no money at all was invested by the Department of Education, either at the state level or the federal level. And you want to know why it's good? It doesn't have to be evaluated. There's no evaluation process, no endless "paper chase." It works because people work at it--no goals and objectives to meet or reports to file. It's just done!

Departments of education should be allowing regional laboratories, like the one that I represent today, to do more of the work that they know has to be done. State departments, federal departments, or whatever, must allow us do more of the things that have to be done and allow us to make a mistake once in a while. Maybe, in that way, we can bring accomplish something for students and teachers.

The immigration policies? I don't think they have changed much. Some of you may want to jot down a couple of cases, like Plyler versus Doe. That's a case from Harlingen, Texas, that went all the way to the Supreme Court. It stipulated that school districts will educate children regardless of residency. In 1992, in a case involving Deming, New Mexico, versus the State Board of Education and the Superintendent, Mr. Morgan, they wanted to quit doing that. See, in Deming, a U.S. school bus goes to the border and picks up Mexican students to take them to school. And people were fighting that. Then, in New Mexico, allocations per student are based on the numbers of youngsters that attend school, and the taxpayers were raising sand on account of that--sand because there's a lot of sand in New Mexico. So the school district was saying, "Hey, it's not costing you that much money because most of our money comes from the state, not from local property taxes." In August of 1992, the Supreme Court ruled again that that was not against the law. So you've got this constant stream of students coming back and forth from Mexico into the U.S., from the U.S. into Mexico, and the law says "you will educate them. You cannot deny them an education."

You might want to read those two court cases. They're very interesting. Plyler versus Doe and then the one in New Mexico against the Deming Independent School District and the Superintendent.

NAFTA? Folks, we've had NAFTA along the border for many years. I went into Juárez about 2 weeks ago. Kentucky Fried Chicken is there, the Holiday Inn is there, you name it, they're all there. There's not a Walmart in place, but there's a "Hypermart". The same thing only bigger and better--connected to the Walmart family.

So I'm saying this: NAFTA has now brought us together, courtesy of Mary. But I'll guarantee you that while NAFTA may be just a topic that's here for us today, for the people along the border

it has been there for many, many years. This might be a way of forcing the issue of providing funds from the state and federal levels to undertake even minimal activities: teacher training, teacher exchanges, student exchanges, and the reciprocal granting of credits.

Good gosh, if the Europeans can handle all of their language diversity, we should be able to handle two languages, at least along the southern U.S. border! Yet many of our politicians are still saying today, "You live in American and you will speak American English." I'm sure you've heard that before.

Les doy las gracias, a la señora Fontaine, y a Uds. que me escucharon, y ojalá, y si nada más se llevan de esta conferencia -- y si creen que les estoy insultando porque estoy hablando en español, no es eso -- nada más que les quiero advertir que por muchos años más, van a seguir viniendo la gente de México a los Estados Unidos, y de los Estados Unidos a México.

The problem is not the Canadians coming to the US. We all look a lot like Peter. I'll never be asked for I.D. in the northern part of the United States--in Wisconsin where Mary's from. But rest assured, if I go along the border and my name is Reyna, García, Flores, Adidas, or whatever, I'm going to be stopped for my I.D.

I thank you very much, and I'll be glad to answer questions at a later time.

GREGORIO LUKE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, MEXICAN CULTURAL INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Muy buenos días, también, o tardes serán.

It is sometimes thought that there is a great divide--before NAFTA and after NAFTA--as if we suddenly awoke to a new reality. In fact, as Dr. Reyna and Dr. García have indicated, we have been witnessing these processes of transformation in education and cultural exchanges between our countries for many years. And as is true in the commercial and economic fields, we have also seen a great transformation in the educational system of Mexico.

In the past few years, Mexico has gone from a very centralized educational system to a decentralized one. We have also seen an increase, in real terms, of 70% in the budget for education in Mexico, as well as a modernization of the curricula and redesigning of textbooks. During this period, a strong relationship has developed among our countries, specifically between Mexico and the United States.

In 1990, the Secretaría de Educación Pública (SEP) and the U.S. Department of Education signed a Memorandum of Understanding that provides the framework for exchange in many areas of education. Among them are early childhood education, education to prevent drug abuse, migrant education, bilingual education in both nations, technical education, school-to-work transition, adult education, educational research, distance education, and higher education. Of great importance has been the establishment of the Mexico Commission for Education and Cultural Exchange, which has substantially increased the funding of studies, research, instruction and other educational activities. Also, it finances exchanges between Mexico and the U.S. for student research, fellowships, artists, and cultural exchanges. The rewards are being reaped by the museums of our nations, the publications that tell about the union of our culture, the performing arts that allow our people to communicate and build bridges of understanding, and our youth, who are given knowledge with which to transform our societies. These are all examples of our relations in the past, as well as indicators for the potential of our future.

The immediate problems tend to be, as always, funding and resources. Much effort is required in these areas. In addition to the governmental efforts it is important to incorporate the private sector and society at large in these activities.

Recent developments, such as the convention between Mexico and the U.S. for the avoidance of double taxation stipulate that contributions made by a citizen or resident of the U.S. to a

Mexican Organization operated for scientific, literary, or educational purposes, shall be treated as deductible contributions, just as if they were made to a U.S. charity, and, visa-versa for a Mexican contribution made to a U.S. institution. In this way, resources are made available that were once difficult to direct towards education and training.

I believe initiatives like "Hands Across the Border" are very exciting. Young Americans discover first-hand what the Mexican people are really like. Mexican youths also discover the same of the American people. It is very important that we encourage exchanges such as these.

When I was first appointed to the Embassy of Mexico in Washington, D.C., I had the opportunity to monitor a teacher exchange in which a Mexican teacher was invited to teach in a U.S. high school and an American teacher was invited to teach in Mexico. I can assure you that those Mexican students will never think of Americans in the same way again--and the American students will not think of the Mexicans in the same way. When we promote exchanges between students and teachers, we encourage people to understand each other. In the process, we eliminate preconceived notions. Walls of prejudice that once existed are torn down and stereotypes are erased.

We must encourage the dissemination of information and knowledge. We should encourage students to travel, to take part in exchanges, and to know the truth about our nations and the people that inhabit them.

It is appropriate, and timely, to take advantage of the current climate of good will that exists in our three countries by informing and proposing initiatives and activities that capture the imagination of the population at large. We should find a way to make these complex accords understandable to the general public and to turn them into programs in which people can participate.

I am reminded of the Sister City program, an initiative developed in the 1950s that served as an umbrella for uniting different cities throughout the nation and encouraged them to develop direct relationships. That program has been very successful because it built networks of friendship at a grass root level.

It occurs to me that something similar could be attempted in the field of education. Many schools in our three countries have already established exchanges. However, these contacts are still isolated and there are not any simple, well-known mechanisms to establish educational exchanges.

The creation of a traditional organization dedicated solely to the purpose of receiving applications from schools interested in

establishing exchanges and then recommending compatible schools in other countries would greatly encourage the exchange process.

A sister school organization would generate thousands of contacts that could range from pen-pals to teacher and student exchanges, or the development of joint research programs. The importance of the initiative would be that it would empower principals, teachers, and students to establish direct links.

I am convinced that by enabling our young people to meet and study, we are sewing the seeds of friendship between our nations for the future.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q: How can we continue to support ongoing bilateral or trilateral exchanges--or find funding for new ones? Some programs have been going on for years and have been very successful. But funding is limited or running out even in the U.S.--and especially difficult to obtain for urban schools that don't have a history of this type of involvement. The greatest cost is airline travel and food. While private support has been suggested, that's very difficult to organize. The bottom line is that individual schools need to be able to fund these exchanges. Schools love the exchanges, and interest is increasing--but they can't afford them, even though they undertake fundraising activities. For schools in Mexico, it's even more difficult. What do you suggest?

A: I think there is an urge to relate, to connect across borders, and I know there are a number of efforts to do so. I also think it would be helpful if they could be centralized somehow. This would make it easier for fund-raising and information sharing purposes. So I think that, number one, it would be important to have a place where all these different exchanges could connect with each other. Number two, I think that other information should also be available, such as directories of American companies that have interests across the border and that might be interested in funding this. As I said before, there is a new provision, which many people are not aware of, that allows American corporations to deduct such funding from their taxes.

This should not only be done by private sources, of course. Governments have a responsibility to explore and to encourage these exchanges, too. And to "encourage" is also to fund and to help the process.

I would also like to point out that, because of the public nature of Mexican universities, many of them are practically free. If the money value of tuition for a higher Mexican education is compared to the tuition for a U.S. institution the relationship is probably 100 to 1. These differences in the education system should also be considered.

Q: Back in 1991, when we had the border conference, we headed a particular session on business and education partnerships, and that's one of the things that Mexico was very interested in. At the time, the Mexican Government was not giving businesses the tax breaks that you're talking about now. However, that has changed as a result of the initiative you described

The other thing, too, is that in Mexico, when you had a

centralized educational system, you knew everything that was happening up here in the US and had contact with almost every US school. Due to the decentralization of the US system, it's a state and local government issue. We don't know about many of the things that are happening, such as the National Association of Secondary School Principals programs. A lot of us are not aware of these things at the national level.

We do know, for instance, about the program that Mauro referred to at Laredo State University, which is Texas A & M, and the courses they are offering on history and government in about 15 or 20 institutions in Mexico for teachers there to take the courses in order to be eligible to teach in Texas. They're doing the same thing in California. Ed Leahey, last year, I think, brought in 50 teachers from Mexico. Schools have done it in Chicago and Houston as well.

But again, since the US system is decentralized, we're not sufficiently aware of these programs, and I hope that through NAFTA we'll be able to have a coalition or a commission of some sort to keep track of this information.

A: Absolutely. Another thing I wanted to mention is that, together with the exchange of people, new technologies are creating enormous opportunities. I am familiar with schools such as the Tecnológico in Monterrey, or the University of New Mexico that are using interactive video technology. For example, in Monterrey you can have a master's program that is taught at Yale or Harvard, beamed through a satellite, with the ability to interact with students.

So, more and more, we see that parallel to the movement of people we can also use all these new technologies not just for entertainment purposes, but also as a way of exchanging knowledge, and I think that that's another great avenue.

Q: I just want to suggest that Congress needs to be convinced that the use of federal dollars is in fact legitimate for these kinds of exchanges and collaboration. In our ESEA provision, which is between $7 and $10 billion, we're prohibited. We have the provision, but we're already hearing from Congress, "We want those dollars to be spent in the United States." We need to change a little bit of the culture of some of our representatives so that they understand that the collaboration activities we're talking about are really in the best interest of the United States.

Q: In the folder there is a flyer from the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education talking about the upcoming Conference on the Globalization of Higher Education in May. There are 10 professional associations that are meeting and preparing to discuss the globalization of their professions.

There is a notable absence of the teaching profession, of people speaking for the Offices of Education, the schools of education and present educators. Several of the speakers today drew attention to the problems of teacher training and the need for new education leadership that can help articulate these rules of cooperation in education, including comparability in training of educators. Can anybody respond to why the education professions are not there and how we can get them there?

A: It depends upon whose paying for it, and it's Mexico who is paying for this conference. There is an asymmetry right now as to who is responsive to NAFTA. We have a problem in US higher education, which is both a problem and a blessing, since we are separated from our government constitutionally, whereas, in Mexico there is a connection, at least with the public arena. These are the 10 professions that Mexico now feels most important to develop in terms of common educational standards for North America. And there is a total right now of about $6.5 million being set aside for efforts relative to them and their development within the United States. Teacher education would be of extreme importance. Private foundations, the US Department of Education, USIA--not AID, (although I'd be happy to talk) have been approached--in addition to teacher education and about 50 other groups where there currently exists crediting activities in the US and Canada, 14 of which are already bilateral. It would be wise to talk about expanding this program.

Q: I have a question about curricula to ask Dr. García, but I would welcome answers from other people as well. Are there any plans for an international curriculum? It's wonderful that Mexican and US schools would grant credit for one another's courses. But how meaningful is that when the young person is ready to apply for university? Also, as part of an international curriculum, what will be the second language requirements?

A: Secretary Riley would remind us that what we're looking at is a set of content standards. What are the things that we expect children to know? One of our initiatives is to work with Mexico on this issue. We must agree on what it is kids should know, what they should know after 5th grade, or when they're 10 or 12 or 14. And if we have those common understandings, then there will be plenty of leeway to develop common curriculum. However, I used to be a school board member, too, so be very careful about trying to force me in Fargo, North Dakota, or wherever to have an international curriculum. I certainly wouldn't have a problem with some common content standards, in that children in my city or locale would have the same opportunity to achieve those standards as they would in Mexico or Canada. Our efforts, more recently, with Mexico will in fact discuss issues of curriculum that in fact are aligned with those content standards. Mexico is also moving in those same directions. They do have a common core curriculum; we don't in the United States, but we are moving

towards these national standards, so there is where the discussion will be. It's a different area at the higher education level. I'm talking about K-12. As someone has indicated from Canada, we do have the emergence of common curriculum at the level of higher education that allows transferable credits, and that we would certainly be supportive of.

Q: That's different from something like an international baccalaureate?

A: The question has to do with regional studies, or an international baccalaureate. Now, let me first say that Canada and the United States --provincially and statewide-- have had a series of ongoing reciprocal agreements for the transfer of credit, curriculum, and degrees K through 12 probably from before the First World War. Because of the constitutional development of Canada, education is a provincial responsibility, so the most populated provinces that border the United States have had a migration of people and educational standards from the beginning. At the university level, most, if not all Canadian universities are tied in through a series of private sector arrangements with US universities to transfer students, credits, and degrees.

What the Canadian Government is trying to put together now would mirror this concept of an international baccalaureate in which we would have a North American Studies degree. We are also, in tandem and with the same energy, developing our Canadian Studies program worldwide, primarily in the United States. Specifically, in the United States we have 52 centers at different US universities that grant everything from a minor to a BA through the Ph.D. level in Canadian Studies. Canadian Studies can be easily augmented and expanded to include North American Studies by adding the Mexican component, and that's what we're trying to do right now. We have about 20,000 US students a year taking at least one course on Canada, and many of these courses are geared towards North American integration, North American economic development, peopling, if you will, or the human side, and migration of peoples in the North American context. So because of the permeability of the border between Canada and the United States, it is a concept that has come to fruition in Canada. What we want to do now is see that extended into Mexico to take into account the human side of the trading regime.

Q: I'm interested in posing a question to our Department of Education officials. We have to look to the Federal Government for assistance in providing educational services to students along the border whom we must accomodate, but we need help. We're very appreciative of some of the special federal programs that tend to funnel money to those areas, be it the Chapter 1 disadvantaged and bilingual education or the emergency immigration funds, but it isn't enough.

Is the Federal Government Department of Education pushing any kind of initiatives to help border regions with these border issues either in the form of new initiatives or expanding and increasing the funding of these programs to help us out?

A: So the question is, is the Federal Government looking at any kind of either general or special provisions for assistance to the border areas? You will be a big supporter of our proposed Title 1 formula in Texas, which would send 24% more dollars to Texas, much of which will go right along the border. I'm not sure everyone in Congress is a great supporter of that right now, but we want to see the concentration of dollars where there are needs, and right now there is a nice synchronization of border areas and where those dollars are going to go.

Secondly, in Title 7, we are agreeing to a specific obligation by the Hispanic Caucus to do a border area study. We need to take a look at what is going on along the border and other gateway communities so that we have special provisions for further analysis which would lead to more directed dollars to you.

However, I also want to say that you're talking about a federal machinery that provides only 8% of the dollars to your schools, so please, you've got to have state and local dollars attend to these issues. They're going to be much more substantive, and you have to leverage the 8% on the 92% that comes from local and state resources. So when you look to us for your salvation, I have to say to you, you're looking to someone who only controls 8% of the purse strings. Everyone else controls the rest.

Q: As I say, we are appreciative and we do understand that the federal share is very, very small, but we're talking about a US border here not an individual state border. Texas happens to be the state that is right there, and as a result of being on the US border, that increases the emphasis. It seems to me that it should become more of a federal initiative than you would normally expect it to be.

A: We don't disagree that there ought to be special emphasis in areas like the border, but we also have places like Los Angeles, which you wouldn't think of as a border, which is being affected by the same thing. New York is not considered border, but there's a substantive immigrant Mexican community there. The issues are not just border issues, they're issues having to deal with linguistic and cultural diversity. We understand and respect the special circumstances, but we also need to understand other broader circumstances.

A: Just a very brief point I wanted to address in relation to something that Dr. Garcia said a little further back, on the question of funding, in which he mentioned the reluctance of Congress regarding the use of appropriated funds in other

countries. In the EC, we have a very similar reluctance on the part of legislators to appropriate funds for use in third countries. And, likewise, there's always a reluctance on the part of EC legislators, the Council of Ministers, to appropriate any funds for programs such as education where they're not going directly back into the legislator's own home patch.

But there is a rule of thumb--I don't know how accurate it is--but the rule of thumb is that about two-thirds of funds that are appropriated for the use of programs such as education and training tend to be recycled back anyway to the contributing country, which is quite apart from the indirect spin-offs that derive from programs in either our own member states or neighboring countries.

So in terms of justifying and advocating the appropriation of funds for the use of programs abroad: the money doesn't just disappear; it very often finds its way back. And the rule of thumb that the EC uses is that, in any case, a good two-thirds of these funds find their way directly back to the contributing country.

COMMENT: I live in a community here in Washington, D.C., which is just up the street from the Mexican Embassy, by the way, and I'd be pleased to introduce Dr. García or anybody else to what a gateway in this part of the country looks like, and how it functions, and what that means for inner-city politics.

Q: Dr. Reyna made a real plea for the governments to allow people to do more of what they need to do. There was a lot of discussion between the Departments of Education and Labor when the School to Work Transition legislation was developed. Is there any similar discussion going on with the new Clinton proposal that will deal with the workers displaced by NAFTA?

A: Let me just say that we're in the discussion stages. The School to Work has been ongoing for about 6 or 7 months, and it's a nice model that we're trying to use. We are thinking through, with the Department of Labor and others such as Housing, ways in which we are going to comprehensively respond as an administration to the issue that you've raised, which is directly related to NAFTA. But we're only at the discussion stages.

A: The retraining of workers is very much a part of this, I think. Another part that I'd like to mention, in reference to the question of whether or not there are any additional funds coming from the Federal Government--one of the things that Dr. García failed to mention, and I think he is being modest--is that he's trying to get the Emergency Immigration Act to go into a federal formula program rather than a state formula. That way the funds can be concentrated where the need is the greatest. So through his efforts, I hope that we can get some action on that.

Q: What about the practical, legal implications of NAFTA on public education? The NEA has advised that the legal provisions of NAFTA do not affect or do not apply to public education in this country, and I'm wondering about some of the compliance provisions, the procurement provisions, the contracting out provisions of NAFTA. We have been advised that they do not apply to public services in general and public education specifically. I'm looking for someone else to confirm that they have a similar understanding or an opposing understanding for public education in this country.

A: Absolutely. NAFTA does not allow any expenditure of funds to even to bring groups of people together like this through NAFTA. I think that the time has come for educators to grab a hold of industry: we have this way of allowing industry to participate and get a tax deduction on this, and we're not working on it.

But why not, for example, put pressure on industry and say that 1/accommodate of 1% of everything that goes into Mexico will be the tax put on these folks, going in and coming out. Then that money will be used by, let's say, the state where these folks are from specifically for education. The Government today has not set aside any money for educational needs as far as NAFTA is concerned. But I think that industry should be more involved than in just a Hands Across the Border or "adopt-a-school" type of thing. That's good PR for the companies, but we need to put the money where we really need it. You have these giants that are taking in 18-wheelers by the hundreds every day, and I'm not kidding--more than a hundred 18-wheelers go across into Mexico and come back with the finished product on a daily basis, 24 hours a day.

A: I have to respond to that because it's in direct contradiction to the NAFTA Treaty, and I'll tell you why. This is the problem: I applaud the initiative and the desire to channel funds from the private sector. But the NAFTA Treaty clearly prohibits you from any sort of import-export tax on goods or people moving across the border. That contradicts the major premise of the entire treaty. What you need to do, and this refers back to the secondary education exchange program, is to talk to the Directors of the Chambers of Commerce in the cities that you're interested in and then go to the companies themselves and sell them on a private sector initiative. Say, "Look, it will look good when you can use your logo. You give us 1%. Give us 1% of your PR budget." Don't take it out of their P&L, don't take it out of their bottom-line statement. Don't say, "We're going to take your profit." Give us 1% or .05% of what you're spending anyway, and we can give you a real bang for that buck. We can give you advertising, we can promote your product. When we bring students across the border, the students may be wearing the logo of your company on the back of their jackets. That's the way to do it.

Otherwise we'll have to renegotiate the treaty.

A: It's not that I disagree with you, but the fact is that if we don't put anything in writing, IBM is not going to respond out of the goodness of its heart. They're going to say, "Good gosh, our stock just went down, and you want some more money from us?" I think it's going to have to be a forced issue, and I don't want to renegotiate the treaty because that'll take us 10, 20, or 30 years. But I think that something has to be done, and if you want to negotiate, let's negotiate. But if you don't put that down in writing, the PR guy is going to say, "Advertising just went up on radio, TV, etc., and as a matter of fact, I need more money."

A: Whatever stance or attitude you bring to the argument, the position of my government on this--and make no mistake about it--is no tax on goods and people moving back and forth across the border. That's the bottom line.

Q: I have another technical question about the NAFTA Treaty. What about the NAD Bank? The NAFTA Treaty specifically targets development issues along the border environment. Why not schools?

A: Let me answer that since I'm doing the technical end of NAFTA. The question is about a new organization being put together by the IMF, the IDB and the World Bank, with contributions by Canada, the US and Mexico, called the NAD Bank. It is still on paper. It hasn't gotten out into praxis yet.

NAFTA is a commercial treaty. Closed sentence, period. If you want NAFTA to do things other than that, what you have to do is go to the people who are making the profits from it and act through the private sector. You cannot go back to the governments and say, "Stick another clause in here or empower an economic treaty to do social things." Of course it will, but you have to work through NGOs, organizations like yourselves, and different business industries or business concerns. There are all sorts of different consortiums in the private sector that want to promote trade and want to promote the development of the infrastructure.
The NAD Bank is designed--and, of course, as I say, it hasn't come to fruition yet--to enhance commercial interests, to allow lesser developed countries, such as areas of Mexico, to develop infrastructure so that they can compete and prosper in a very competitive global marketplace.

A: You might want to use the approach that the EPA used. There was nothing in NAFTA for EPA purposes or the compliance of laws as far as the damage that was being done to the surrounding areas, around the *maquiladoras*. And all of a sudden, they found a way of taking care of all of that environmental type of

activity, did they not? But the educators, were always back-of-the-bus so to speak, and now it's too late. I agree with you. It can't be done.

A: It's not the vehicle to do it.

A: That's right, I know it. And neither was EPA! But they got on that vehicle, and now the companies have to pay for the cleanup of all their industry.

A: There's a little history behind the EPA story. We can't just drop it out of the sky and say, here's an example. I mean, I understand the arguing point, but in actuality, that's a little specious.

A: Most of you have a copy of the Supplementary Agreement. That's where the environmental thing came in. Education, like I said, was left out completely in NAFTA, and I don't know whether it was done purposely or not.

A: Definitely. The possibilities of exchange and the multiplicity of relationships that exist between the US, Mexico and Canada are endless. You can try to make a treaty or a pact that would solve all the different bilateral issues that can arise: for example, you can make a case for health provisions and many others. It would be impossible to negotiate a treaty that could resolve all of these issues. So it's not that education was left out, it's simply that the free-trade agreement concerns the exchange of goods, of products, and I would say that the greater exchanges in trade propitiate other types of arrangements that will include other problems as have been mentioned. What I'm trying to say is that this is not an exclusionary thing; it's simply that NAFTA is a trade agreement --*Vaya, no hay que pedir las peras al olmo* -- you can't ask for pears from the peach tree.

Q: AASA is working on a conference that will be attached to the "Hands Across the Border" Conference in March. We're bringing together some educational leaders, including a number of National Superintendents of the Year, to meet with Mexican school leaders.

I've been listening for an agenda to discuss all of this, and I have heard: exchange of credits; exchange of educators; exchange of students; exchange of cultural information and experiences; sharing of information on educational topics and issues; what the content of education in Mexico, Canada and the United States; dealing with the myths and stereotypes; education reform; and this type of communication that we hope to get going (Dr. Reyna talked about that eloquently--the type of communication we need that isn't there yet, except in certain programs such as Hands Across the Border); bilingual and ESL programs; recruitment, placement and retention of teachers; and the exchange of publications. How are we going to get this done? What kind of

infrastructure will we need to get it rolling and to keep it going? How can we share information about what's happening to make this all dynamic so that it builds on itself and grows? How can we break down the barriers that exist in collaboration--a whole family of issues there--and make the connection so it benefits all the countries involved individually and collectively? I would add to the list the connection with countries and economic alliances that aren't necessarily involved directly in NAFTA and, finally, the funding of those efforts.

I would just ask that you call us if you feel that any of those items are inappropriate, or if there are other items that ought to be on that list, because we take this very seriously, and we want our Association to play a leadership role. Our members are administrators and principals, and we need your help.

A: I didn't hear you mention distance learning and clearinghouses and databases, which are very useful things to play up.

A: That's quite an agenda, and to my knowledge there is no group, committee or coalition that has been established to continue on with some of the things we just touched on today. What happens next, I guess, is the question.

A: There is. It's the Trilateral Commission set up by Canada, US and Mexico. They've met twice already, and they'll meet again in Cancún in May. They are working groups, a panel similar to this, of practitioners and stakeholders, educators, government people and others from the private and public sectors who are talking about and forming policies on how to implement all these things. There's discovery meetings to get it into law, to present to different municipalities, and things like that.

Q: Could I get some information on this group: whose involved, how to reach them, what they've done so far?

A: It is under the auspices of USIA.

A: No, it's not!

Q: USIA is providing the money, though.

A: No, they're not.

Q: Mexico's giving the $100,000?

A: Mexico is the only one.

Q: Is this K through 12?

A: No, this is higher education. You're right about K through

12.

Q: You teach your kids 9 languages in Europe. I sometimes have to wonder why we can't even manage one in this country. I mean, there must be tips that we can learn from you if we have any desire to include French and Spanish as a part of our curriculum.

A: Let me leave you with this thought: it doesn't stop at nine because there are 11 in LINGUA, including one that you've probably never heard of called Luxembourgois, which I hadn't heard of, but it doesn't stop at that because we'll soon be 15. And when we have working meetings, we have to have interpreters between all the official languages, which means 72 language pairs. When we go to 15 official languages, I leave you to work out the exponential degrees of language pairing. It's a huge problem.

MARY FONTAINE: Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very much for being here. I would also like to express my thanks to Richard Long from the International Reading Association who provided the room for us here today and to the Committee for Education Funding for helping us make the arrangements, for promoting the meeting and for being with us here today.