

Mr. GORTON. My answer to that question is an unqualified yes. Of course we should do just that. What we must take great care with is seeing to it that any national standards strengthen and encourage the standards that are already being set in any of the States; that they be able to move forward; not an excuse to move backward; and that they measure real knowledge. I believe that the heart of some of the objections to the national standards are the ones made by the American Federation of Teachers to Washington State mathematics. There just is no way except in the heart of some totally abstract profession that you can justify giving 100 percent to a student who gets the wrong answer to a question. It may be encouraging students to move towards a way to come up with the right answer. But that is not something that ought to get 100 percent.

I hope we derive a system for whatever national tests come, and I think some are likely to come that measure real knowledge and real progress, and that encourages States to make their own standards even tougher and their assessments to take place more frequently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORTON. I ask for two additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. I would just like to say in summary that I am in no way critical of what my State has done, and the movement towards these standards I find very encouraging. I think absent these constructive criticisms that they are likely to set very, very good and very significant standards. It is just that I have to predicate the comment that we shouldn't be discouraged by the results. We should be discouraged by the results. And we should resolve that we are going to do everything possible to cause those results to improve markedly and as quickly as possible.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator to yield for one additional question, I come from a school where I was involved in a graduating class of nine. I come from a county that has 3,000 people. The community in which I grew up has 300 citizens. My high school class was a class of nine. That school district was educating the children in my school to go out into the workplace and to do things with the kind of background they gave us in a different time. And that school district still exists, and the school still exists. It is still a very small school. But now those children that are being educated in that school are going out into the marketplace in a different era. We are now involved in much different kinds of global competition in which we are competing against kids in Germany and Japan who are going to school 240 days a year. Our kids are going to school 180 days a year competing with respect to jobs and economic

opportunity. And it is a much different world. That ought not suggest that we manage in any way our schools differently. The control and the authority and the payment for the schools ought to come from local government and local school districts and State governments.

But the point that is made by the people in the technology area, by the chamber of commerce and elsewhere, is that we are involved in global competition, and our education system must produce the quality of education that meets that competition in order for this country to succeed and to achieve what we want to achieve in the future.

That is why it is important for us to be discussing these issues. What are we getting for our education dollar? And are we achieving with our children proficient levels of mathematics in the fourth grade and education in the eighth grade, and how do we measure that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the Senator from Washington for yielding.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his thoughtful comments, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. RES. 120

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon today, the Senate proceed to the consideration of a resolution regarding Mother Teresa that was submitted today by Senators NICKLES, LOTT, and DASCHLE. I further ask unanimous consent that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form. I finally ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 2:15 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to a vote on the adoption of the resolution with no intervening action or debate. This resolution has been cleared by the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1061, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and

Human Services, and Education and related agencies for fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Gregg amendment No. 1070, to prohibit the use of funds for national testing in reading and mathematics, with certain exceptions.

Coats-Gregg amendment No. 1071 (to Amendment No. 1070), to prohibit the development, planning, implementation, or administration of any national testing program in reading or mathematics unless the program is specifically authorized by Federal statute.

Nickles-Jeffords amendment No. 1081, to limit the use of taxpayer funds for any future International Brotherhood of Teamsters leadership election.

Craig-Jeffords amendment No. 1083 (to Amendment No. 1081), in the nature of a substitute.

Durbin amendment No. 1078, to repeal the tobacco industry settlement credit contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Durbin amendment No. 1085, to provide for the conduct of a study concerning efforts to improve organ and tissue procurement at hospitals, and require a report to Congress on the study.

Durbin (for Levin) amendment No. 1086, to express the sense of the Senate that hospitals that have significant donor potential shall take reasonable steps to assure a skilled and sensitive request for organ donation to eligible families.

Mack-Graham amendment No. 1090, to increase the appropriations for the Mary McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center.

McCain-Graham amendment No. 1091, to eliminate Medicare incentive payments under plans for voluntary reduction in the number of residents.

McCain-Kerry amendment No. 1092, to ensure that payments to certain persons captured and interned by North Vietnam are not considered income or resources in determining eligibility for, or the amount of benefits under, a program or State plan under title XVI or XIX of the Social Security Act.

Craig-Bingaman amendment No. 1093, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to adjust the maximum hour exemption for agricultural employees.

Landrieu amendment No. 1095, to increase funds to promote adoption opportunities.

Coverdell amendment No. 1097, to enhance food safety for children through preventative research and medical treatment.

Coverdell amendment No. 1098 (to Amendment No. 1097), in the nature of a substitute.

Specter (for Nickles) amendment No. 1109, to require that estimates of certain employer contributions be included in an individual's social security account statement.

Specter amendment No. 1110, to reduce unemployment insurance service administrative expenses to offset costs of administering a welfare-to-work jobs initiative.

Specter amendment No. 1111, to provide start-up funding for the National Bi-partisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

Harkin (for Wellstone) amendment No. 1087, to increase funding for the Head Start Act.

Harkin (for Wellstone) amendment No. 1088, to increase funding for Federal Pell Grants.

Harkin (for Wellstone) amendment No. 1089, to increase funding for the Education Infrastructure Act of 1994.

Harkin-Bingaman-Kennedy amendment No. 1115, to authorize the National Assessment Governing Board to develop policy for voluntary national tests in reading and mathematics.

Harkin (for Daschle) amendment No. 1116, to express the sense of the Senate regarding Federal Pell Grants and a child literacy initiative.

Ford amendment No. 1117 (to Amendment No. 1078), to express the sense of the Senate on compensation for tobacco growers as part of legislation on the national tobacco settlement.

Murray-Wellstone amendment No. 1118, to clarify the family violence option under temporary assistance to needy families program.

Murray amendment No. 1119, to provide funding for the National Institute for Literacy.

Harkin (for Bennett) amendment No. 1120, to award a grant to a State educational agency to help pay the expenses associated with exchanging State school trust lands within the boundaries of a national monument for Federal lands outside the boundaries of the monument.

Ford (for Kerrey) amendment No. 1121, to exempt States that were overpaid mandatory funds for fiscal year 1997 under the general entitlement formula for child care funding from any payment adjustment.

Domenici (for Gorton) amendment No. 1122, to provide certain education funding directly to local educational agencies.

Gorton modified amendment No. 1076, to allow States to use funds received under title XXI of the Social Security Act to provide health insurance coverage for children with incomes above the minimum Medicaid eligibility requirements.

AMENDMENT NO. 1122

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up an amendment that I introduced yesterday to provide certain educational funding directly to local educational agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1122, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I send a modification of that amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will read the modification.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], for himself, and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 1122, as modified.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the Senator going to explain the modification?

Mr. GORTON. I will explain the whole amendment, as modified.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 85, after line 23, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Education shall award the total amount of funds described in subsection (b) directly to local educational agencies in accordance with subsection (d) to enable the local educational agencies to support programs or activities

for kindergarten through grade 12 students that the local educational agencies deem appropriate.

(b) The total amount of funds referred to in subsection (a) are all funds that are appropriated for the Department of Education under this Act to support programs or activities for kindergarten through grade 12 students, other than—

(1) amounts appropriated under this Act—

(A) to carry out title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(B) to carry out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

(C) to carry out the Adult Education Act;

(D) to carry out the Museum and Library Services Act;

(E) for departmental management expenses of the Department of Education; or

(F) to carry out the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act;

(G) to carry out the National Education Statistics Act of 1994;

(H) to carry out section 10601 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(I) to carry out section 2102 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; or

(J) to carry out part K of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(K) to carry out title IV-A-5 of the Higher Education Act; or

(2) 50 percent of the amount appropriated under title III under the headings "Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research" and "Vocational and Adult Education".

(c) Each local educational agency shall conduct a census to determine the number of kindergarten through grade 12 students served by the local educational agency not later than 21 days after the beginning of the school year. Each local educational agency shall submit the number of the Secretary.

(d) The Secretary shall determine the amount awarded to each local educational agency under this section as follows:

(1) First, the Secretary, using the information provided under subsection (c), shall determine a per child amount by dividing the total amount of funds described in subsection (b), by the total number of kindergarten through grade 12 students in all States.

(2) Second, the Secretary, using the information provided under subsection (c), shall determine the baseline amount for each local educational agency by multiplying the per child amount determined under paragraph (1) by the number of kindergarten through grade 12 students that are served by the local educational agency.

Lastly, the Secretary shall compute the amount awarded to each local educational agency as follows:

(A) Multiply the baseline amount determined under paragraph (2) by a factor of 1.1 for local educational agencies serving States that are in the least wealthy quintile of all States as determined by the secretary on the basis of the per capita income of individuals in the States.

(B) Multiply the baseline amount by a factor of 1.05 for local educational agencies serving States that are in the second least wealthy such quintile.

(C) Multiply the baseline amount by a factor of 1.00 for local educational agencies serving States that are in the third least wealthy such quintile.

(D) Multiply the baseline amount by a factor of .95 for local educational agencies serving States that are in the fourth least wealthy such quintile.

(E) Multiply the baseline amount by a factor of .90 for local educational agencies serving States that are in the wealthiest such quintile.

(4) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the Secretary shall compute the amount awarded to each local educational agency serving the States of Alaska or Hawaii by multiplying the base line amount determined under paragraph (2) for the local educational agency by a factor of 1.00.

(e) If the total amount of funds made available to carry out this section is insufficient to pay in full all amounts awarded under subsection (d), then the Secretary shall ratably reduce each such amount.

(f) If the Secretary determines that a local educational agency has knowingly submitted false information under subsection (c) for the purpose of gaining additional funds under this section, then the local educational agency shall be fined an amount equal to twice the difference between the amount the local educational agency received under subsection (d), and the correct amount the local educational agency would have received if the agency had submitted accurate information under subsection (c).

(g) In this section—

(1) the term "local educational agency" has the meaning given the term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education; and

(3) the term "State" means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the United States Virgin Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senator from Vermont, the modification strikes all references to any departments other than those going through the Department of Education, and there is a modification with respect to the distribution formula for the States of Alaska and Hawaii, States that have artificially high income levels which do not necessarily reflect the standard of living in those two very expensive States, and adds one additional minor exception to the scope of the bill.

Fundamentally, Mr. President, this amendment is based on the philosophy that the school board members, the administrators, the teachers and the parents in communities all across the United States are better able to set their educational priorities and to meet their educational goals than is the Congress of the United States or bureaucrats of the Department of Education. You can't make a telephone call because we tried to call the Congressional Research Service and ask how many programs there are that support the education of our children between kindergarten and 12th grade.

Instead, they can identify a few programs, large programs, which are devoted exclusively to that purpose, but there are hundreds of others which do so in part that they cannot identify.

Congressman HOEKSTRA of Michigan, in the House, has identified approximately 760 programs funded by the Federal Government directly or indirectly affecting the education of our

children between kindergarten and the 12th grade. No one can say how much of this money actually gets into teaching children as against paying for bureaucrats at the Federal level, the State level, the school district level, or the time it takes the teachers to fill out all of the forms necessary to meet the auditor's requirements of each of these individual programs.

The Cato Institute has determined that of the roughly \$15 billion going from the Department of Education for K through 12 programs only about \$13 billion gets to local education, but it does not and cannot reflect how much the local education agencies have to spend on the administrative requirements of these 760 education programs.

So what this bill says is that with certain exceptions, the largest and most notable of which are the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act that was debated earlier this year, and impact aid, which goes to school districts with a large Federal presence, for 1 year at least we are going to ignore all of these hundreds of programs and their specific requirements and all of the bureaucracy in the Department of Education and simply take the exact number of dollars that are included for those programs in this bill and to distribute them on a per student basis to every school district in the United States. To the best of our ability to do so—and I must confess that in dealing with this number of programs, we may have missed some—we are speaking of a little bit more than \$11 billion of the appropriations in this bill.

We are going to say, instead of our deciding how they ought to be spent, instead of our saying that every school district in the country has to meet exactly the same requirements for getting this money, let us accept the novel idea to which almost all of us give lip service when we are at home that maybe the men and women who are dedicated enough to run for positions on local school boards, maybe the teachers who are in the classroom every day, perhaps the principals and administrators there can use that \$11 billion plus to provide more in the way of educational services than are being provided at the present time. Almost without exception our debates in this Chamber on education policy, when we deal with budget resolutions, when we deal with reconciliation bills, when we deal with this appropriations bill, have to do with how much money we are going to spend on education. It is the firm view of Members of this body and most of the general public that the more money we spend the better the results will be. And yet we are all convinced that the results are not very good. We are disturbed enough about it so that we want to create national standards and national tests.

I just had a discussion on that subject with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN]. At the same time I shared with the body the pioneering work my own State of

Washington is doing in setting standards and testing students against those standards and the highly disappointing results of the first of those sets of tests this year, that only 22 percent of our fourth grade students meet those standards in mathematics. I am convinced that we ought to talk about quality as well as quantity; that simply adding dollars to programs, the net result of which are test results like these and like the others we deprecate all across the country, is not the wisest course of action.

Last year, the Congress in its wisdom did something that Congresses rarely do. We decided that we did not know an awful lot about welfare and that maybe 30 years of an increasing nationalization of welfare policy, the net result of which was worsening almost every social pathology welfare was designed to cure, was not the right course of action. And so in essence we said perhaps we should not set all the requirements ourselves. Perhaps we should let 50 States experiment broadly with welfare policy and maybe all of us will learn more about what works and what does not work.

This amendment gives the Senate the opportunity to do just exactly that with our education policies in kindergarten through 12th grade. Curiously enough, we seem to have largely accepted that policy with respect to higher education. The great bulk of our higher education programs go directly to students—guaranteed student loans, Pell grants, other means tested aid to students go to the customer, the user of educational services rather than to some huge bureaucracy that is given the power to say what colleges and universities can teach and how they teach it.

Now, we know that there are higher educational institutions that do not do a very good job, but our cure has not been to cut off students and stop allowing them to make choices. We do allow them to make those choices. Why don't we try in this particular case—this is not a debate on vouchers and giving money directly to parents, as much as I may favor that. This is a debate about giving the money directly to school districts, to the professionals who work in the classrooms, to the amateurs in almost all cases who run for and are elected to school boards all across the United States. It is difficult for me to imagine, with three Senators in the Chamber, that the priorities of the school districts in Rutland, VT, and Portland, OR, and Bellevue, WA, are going to be identical. It is impossible for me to justify the amount of paperwork that must go into justifying the expenditure of the money for these hundreds and hundreds of programs that go to K through 12 education at the present time, right from the level of the classroom on up through the individual school, to school district, to the State education agency, to the U.S. Department of Education.

Let's take a page out of what we hope will be a successful decentraliza-

tion of our welfare policy and decentralize decisionmaking in our schools. Let our parents through their PTA's, our teachers, our school board members, our principals, decide how to use this \$11 billion to educate kids. And then if we can devise it, we can in fact come up with some tests, some standards that they ought to meet and test them against those standards. What we know now is that the money is not being spent very well, at least it is not being spent very successfully. Let's try temporarily to let someone else make those decisions and see whether we cannot do better.

I am convinced that we will do a great deal better.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I wish to speak against the amendment.

I think the desires and the hopes of the Senator from Washington are certainly admirable, but I think if one examines where the problems are in education right now the thought that it will be solved by just giving a blank check to the local agencies to correct these problems I think would find itself quite misdirected.

First of all, it goes without saying and everybody must recognize that this is probably the grossest exercise of changing the situation from what is normally considered the authorization process that I have seen to date.

Now, I do not disagree with the fundamental problem that the Senator from Washington recognizes, and that is we have an awful problem in this Nation educationally. When 51 percent of the students in this country graduate functionally illiterate, when we find ourselves trailing way behind other nations in competition for the type of work that is necessary in our country, we know we have a problem. Right now, for instance, we have 190,000 jobs available in this Nation that we cannot fill because schools have not produced students with the skills to take them, whereas our competitors do not have that problem.

But where is the problem? The problem is at the local level because they have not had the guidance from above or whatever to increase the mathematical skills and to ensure that we do not push young people through the school systems by what is called social promotion. Those are the big problems. Giving blank checks to the local governments is not going to solve the problems. I would guess it would probably exacerbate them.

For instance, one of the programs that we have which is more aimed at the problems than anything is the Eisenhower math program. It is designed to provide professional development. Congressman GOODLING, who is chairman in the House, and I agree on one thing, that the most important thing we can do now is to improve the professional development of our teachers. If

they don't know what the standards are they should meet in order to meet worldwide competition, then it is difficult to expect that they are going to change to meet those standards. The Eisenhower program has been very successful in the math area, but it is so small that it cannot possibly do all the work. If we were to take and throw more money, if you want to call it throw, into the Eisenhower program and things like that, it might make some sense. But just to give it carte blanche to the districts dependent on the wealth, not on the quality of education, this makes a presumption that is not accurate in many cases, and that is, the quality of your education will be determined by the amount of money that is spent; therefore, if you give more money to the poor areas, they are going to end up with better education, and if you take it away from the ones with higher expenditures on education, they are not going to be hurt. There is no basis for making that kind of conclusion.

Title VI, a block grant, which is chapter 2, is the best hope we have for getting the kind of professional development which Congressman Goodling and I agree is the greatest need of this Nation today that would eliminate the money that goes toward that direction of trying to make sure that we improve the ability of our teachers to meet modern needs of our society.

You can argue about some of the other programs, but School to Work is another one. School to Work is putting its finger on the basic problem in this country, and that is that we do not train our young people for work; we ignore that. The educational institutions, in most cases, are just making some progress now with bringing the school into the work area and letting them know what the young people need for skills in order to get those very well-paying jobs that are out there. School to Work is aimed at that. To cut the funding for that and give more money to the local agencies to do what they want with it is not going to solve the problems of this Nation.

We are going to try to in the Work Force Improvement Act, which we will be moving out of committee very soon, consolidate a lot of these programs that perhaps eat up more money in bureaucracy than they do in producing results. I don't have a problem with that, but that should be done during the reauthorization process. To make such a fundamental change now on an appropriations bill where we would take away from the States—remember, the States distribute title I money and things like that in accordance with not only financial problems, but educational need. This would do away with that aspect and give that role to the Secretary of Education. I am amazed to think the Senator from Washington would suggest we ought to give the money to the Department of Education to distribute. Granted, it is a formula distribution, but still right now it is

the States that make the decisions based upon the educational need as well as economic need.

So I think for all these reasons I would have to strongly oppose this amendment. I encourage, though, as the Senator from Washington has done, to raise the level of understanding of what the problems of this Nation are in education. The basic problem is very fundamental, and that is that the schools in this country are not equipped now to handle the demands made upon them by the competition in the world economic situation which requires us to produce kids that have better skills.

There is certainly no excuse for allowing young people to go through the school system and come out the other end, like half of our kids do, without knowing how to read. That is why emphasis is being placed by the administration, myself, Congressman Goodling and others on that. We have to face up to the problem. Facing up to the problem is not going to solve it by throwing more money and taking it away from any direction at all, but just giving it to the local school system.

I must strongly oppose the amendment of the Senator from Washington, but I do praise him in the sense of raising again the awareness of this body and the Nation to the serious problems we have with education at the local level.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, on this subject, it is obvious that between my friend, the Senator from Vermont, and myself there is a great gulf to fix. I note just a couple of his phrases. One was "carte blanche." The other was the necessity for "guidance from above."

It is the view of the Senator from Vermont that without "guidance from above," our teachers, our school board members, our principals won't know what to do, that they will be clueless about the education of our children for our 21st century world, and that unless they are told by us, right here in this body, U.S. Senators, what their priorities are, how they are going to meet those priorities, and unless we let a group of bureaucrats in the Department of Education, right to the tiniest detail, dictate how Federal money is going to be spent, our teachers, school board members, principals and parents won't have the slightest idea of how to meet these challenges, and they will waste all of this money, it will go for nothing.

Well, my golly, if we had been able to show by tests that we have been overwhelmingly successful, that everyone was doing well, I don't suppose I would be out here now. But one of the other features we are almost certain to authorize, with my conditional approval at least, is to come up with a rational way in which to test our students at various levels with respect to their

knowledge about the most important of the academic subjects they are in school to learn.

My reservations on that is, I have grave fear that national testing may actually drive out more rigid State testing in a number of places across the country. If it encourages even stronger standards, then it seems to me that it is a very, very good idea. It is one thing to test, but it is another thing to tell every teacher, "Here's who you have to teach and here is how you have to teach and, by the way, here are all the forms you have to fill out at some point or another during your school day to make absolutely certain you didn't teach the wrong student and, therefore, disqualify our school district for some of its title I money."

Obviously, every Member of this body who believes that he or she knows more about educational priorities than do his school board members, his teachers, his or her parents should certainly vote against an amendment like this. If Members are content, Mr. President, with between 700 and 760 different education programs coming out of probably five or six different Departments of the U.S. Government, each with its own requirement and its own forms to fill out, if they believe that is a satisfactory way to do things, fine, they should vote for the status quo.

I have more trust in the American people. I have more trust in the people who give up their time without compensation to serve on school boards and in parent-teachers associations. I have more trust in the teachers that we have in the schools themselves. I think they will do a better job with the money. I think we will get better education. Of course, anyone can have a quarrel with the formula for distribution, which is a rough formula giving slightly more money to poor States or school districts in poor States than it does to school districts in wealthy States. But I believe I can make this representation, Mr. President. It will be difficult to find a school district anywhere in the United States that doesn't have more money for the actual education of its students under this formula than it does at the present time. Why? Because at the present time, a whole bunch of this money, hundreds of millions of dollars, gets taken out right here in Washington, DC, by the bureaucracy. More hundreds of millions of dollars get taken out by the State educational entities, and tremendous burdens, nonteaching burdens, are imposed on local schools, school districts and teachers in keeping track of all of it and filling out the forms. So the most disfavored school districts under this formula will actually get more money to put into the education of their students than they do at the present time.

I will be the first to admit, Mr. President, that on the floor of the Senate, this is a brand new and a radical proposal. I would be surprised if it became

law as a part of this appropriations bill. But, Mr. President, we are 10 years past due in discussing this subject. It is time we did here what we say we want to do when we are at home. I can't speak for every other Senator, but I know that one of the most popular statements I can make at a town meeting or to any group in the State of Washington is, "I believe you, through your schools right here, should have more say as to how you spend the money that goes into educating your children." Principals approve of it, school board members approve of it, teachers approve of it, parents approve of it, the taxpaying public approves of it.

I would be willing to make a small wager that, in general terms, almost every Member of this body makes the same speech under appropriate circumstances in his or her own State when he or she is asked about that question. "Yes, I believe in local control of schools. Yes, I believe in locally elected school boards. Yes, I believe decisions can be made better close to the student, but * * *" Usually they don't articulate the "but." "But" comes back here when they actually vote in a manner totally contrary to the way in which they speak at home.

So this provides a simple opportunity, Mr. President, an opportunity to say whether you really do believe that educational policy, that money for education is likely to be spent more wisely and more effectively by those who are in the field doing it professionally, meeting with their students every day, or whether, in the phrase of the Senator from Vermont, they need "guidance from above," guidance from right here in these seats, because otherwise, a *carte blanche* will result in educational disaster.

I hope Members will give serious consideration to this philosophy. This may be the first time we have discussed this in the form of an amendment like this in a number of years, but I do not think, Mr. President, it is going to be the last time. I believe we will discuss the general philosophy of this proposal, at least, increasingly until the time that we are willing in fact to place a degree of trust in local educational authorities that we all say we have in theory.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I will make a couple more comments here.

Let us just think about what would happen if we did this, what it would do for education. All of a sudden, without any qualifications or requirements, or anything else, if we were to send checks to our local governments, with a hope they would spend it on education—I know what would happen in my State.

We have just gone through property tax reform. Everybody is up in arms over the cost to the local governments

from property tax reform. I bet if you were to do it, this would end up in property tax relief. Maybe that is a good thing. Maybe it is a good thing to relieve the local property tax in communities around the country. But it is not going to tackle or do anything to solve the very basic problems we have in education. There is nothing in here that would in any way determine that the local governments are going to spend it on education.

Now, "above" can mean the superintendent of a region, they are knocked out. The State's school system has no control or no suggestions in any way how to spend this money. We are just sending checks to the local communities and saying, "Gee, we would kind of like you to spend this on education, but there's no requirement, or you can say you do, but then you just cut yours back and you spend this money on education, but you cut back on the local money, on what you're spending on education now, and you can cut your property taxes." It might be very popular. I think it would be. I expect it would sell very well with the taxpayers of local communities saying, "Wow, finally we can start going down on the cost of education in this community."

Will it benefit the students? Not at all. This is, again, authorization of the grossest kind in the appropriations process.

So I say to Members that this is one area where we have huge needs trying to change what is going on in this country in education, to raise the levels to be able to meet international competition, to make sure we are not embarrassed again as we have been for years now on international tests with our young people, especially in math and science. We know we have to make changes. Anyone here who believes that just throwing money at the local communities is going to bring about these kinds of changes, I do not think you will find anyone who can consider this is seriously the way to go.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Oregon, be added as a cosponsor to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, that is a truly incredible statement on the part of the Senator from Vermont. In the first place, of course, this amendment does not give this money to local governments. It gives it to local education authorities, that is, school boards and school districts. Evidently the Senator from Vermont feels that his own constituents have so little regard for education in the State of Vermont that they would immediately cut their contribution to the education of their children by the amount of the distribution to those local school

boards. I would be ashamed to make that comment about the people of the State of Washington. I cannot imagine that that would happen.

Moreover, Mr. President, the Senator seems to forget that at least a significant part of this money is in the educational system at the present time. It is my view that just not enough of it gets there, that too much of it gets siphoned by the bureaucrats on the way to a school district in Vermont or in Oregon or in the State of Washington. But to make the statement that only we are wise and only 100 Members of the U.S. Senate are really concerned about education and that, if we were to allow a local school agency to set its own priorities with the money we appropriated to education, that they might not do it, that they would just simply decide, "Oh, no, education isn't very important. We can now cut down our own contribution level," is insulting, I would say, Mr. President, to every citizen of the United States who cares about his or her children or his or her country or their future.

This money is going into education now. That is why we are appropriating it. Too much of it is going to a bureaucracy and not getting to the children who are being educated. Too many priorities are being set here, and too few at home. That is what the question is about.

Mark my words, Mr. President, successful or unsuccessful, if this amendment passes, more money—not less—more money will get into the education of almost every student in the United States of America. The fundamental question is not how much; the fundamental question is, who ought to make the decision as to how it is spent? We here in this body, great educational experts as we seem to think we are, or the people who are actually providing the teaching in the day-to-day operations of our schools?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to yield the floor to the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee who needs some time here to take up another issue, but just quickly before I do that, I do want to congratulate the Senator from Washington, Senator GORTON, for his proposal here, because it has highlighted what is the core debate in the issue of education, which has been raised in part by the President.

This administration's approach to education is about the same as it has approached campaign finance reform—talks one game; does another game. Basically, the purpose of almost all the

major initiatives that have come out of this administration on the issue of education have been to encourage and strengthen the control of the Federal Government over the process of educating children. Every initiative that seems to come out of this administration seems to have been drawn up in the bowels of the major labor unions, major teaching unions here in Washington, the purpose of which appears to be the fundamental goal of moving the control of education out of the local communities and into the Federal sector, out of the hands of the parents, out of the hands of the teachers, out of the hands of the school systems at the local level, into the hands of the Federal bureaucracy, into the hands of the big labor unions centered here in Washington.

Their education initiatives can almost all be characterized as having that as their basic philosophical groundwork, whether it happens to be their initial proposal on Goals 2000, which luckily was amended so that that did not happen, or their initial proposal on national educational testing, which the President has now backed off of because the country has been alarmed by it and which he is changing.

What Senator GORTON's proposal does is say, "Let's end it right here. Let's return to the local folks, people who control the educational process, people who should be involved in the educational process, specifically, the parents, the teachers, the principals, local school boards, the capacity to manage the money we have the Federal Government presently controlling. Let's end this huge bureaucracy which is draining off billions of dollars annually from the students of this country, turning it over to a class of individuals whose basic goal is to perpetuate their own careers versus perpetuating better education. Let's put an end to that. Let's give the dollars right to the schools. Let's let the schools, the parents, the teachers and the principals make the decision."

It really should not be a unique or radical idea. It should be a very common, very appropriate idea. But in the context of the strange thought process which dominates the beltway, it appears to be a radical idea.

Actually, I congratulate the Senator from Washington, Senator GORTON, for putting forward this initiative. I think it is going to generate a very huge and positive debate of the question of where the control of education should be. I look forward to participating in that debate. But I do not wish to take further time from the Senator from Delaware. Therefore, I yield the floor at this point.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 1091

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the McCain amendment on graduate medical education, amend-

ment No. 1091. I oppose it, although I am sure it is well-intentioned. I believe this amendment is not appropriate on this bill. I also believe the amendment is based on some misunderstandings.

But first, as a general rule, I do oppose any amendments on appropriations bills designed or related to Medicare or any other matter that we dealt with in the Balanced Budget Act. Some of these amendments may seem non-controversial or even desirable; however, it is simply not appropriate to begin loading up important appropriations legislation with amendments unrelated to the underlying bill.

Let us remember the ink is hardly dry on the Balanced Budget Act. If we begin the process of reopening this legislation, I assure you there will be no end to other amendments.

Many of these amendments will likely affect matters important to other Members and their States.

Then there is the matter of good faith. A provision in the McCain amendment would strike a House provision we accepted in the conference on BBA. I am sure there are many Senate provisions the House would like to strike.

Mr. President, I will briefly comment on the substance of the McCain amendment. The McCain amendment eliminates funding for a program that would provide assistance to teaching hospitals that voluntarily choose to downsize their residency programs. The funds provided through this program will partially cushion the financial losses teaching hospitals will incur as they reduce the number of doctors in training.

Members should know that Medicare does not simply pay teaching hospitals for training but rather for care given to Medicare patients. These funds do not reimburse hospitals for doing nothing, as some claim. Far from it. Hospitals will use their funds to hire staff doctors, nurse practitioners, physician assistants and other personnel to replace the residents. These funds will also help teaching hospitals, often the Nation's best hospitals, to adjust to a highly competitive health care marketplace and develop alternate means of caring for vulnerable uninsured patients.

One last point. The provision that the McCain amendment would strike saves at least \$380 million in Medicare over the next 5 years, according to CBO. Let me emphasize this important point. Medicare will actually save money as we help the Nation's teaching hospitals. The McCain amendment would add to the deficit by almost \$400 million because no offset is provided.

Mr. President, once again, I urge Members to oppose the McCain amendment on graduate medical education.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to support my revered and respected chairman in this regard. It is the case,

sir, that 5 legislative days ago we passed this measure. It is a measure which originated in the House and in a good faith exchange in conference the Senate accepted it, the conferees did. There were three of us—Mr. LOTT, the chairman, and myself. The bill passed Congress in a spending measure that was appropriate to the occasion.

Now, first, although it is not technical, it is so profoundly important. This is legislation on an appropriations bill. It is the ancient wisdom of this body not to do such things. A point of order would obviously lie against the amendment. It is important. It is how we proceed in this body.

Further, sir, on the merits of this matter, I, for my part, would have to say I would like to see how this works. This is a 5-year period. I can attest, and I know that my colleague from New York and our chairman would agree, the Finance Committee has been seized with this subject. As the medical care system of our country becomes more rationalized, as economists would put it, as price considerations enter into markets and decisions are made, and health maintenance organizations rise and you see all manner of mergers and acquisitions and the general evidence of a market which is good, you also find yourself with some of those effects which are common which involve institutions or desirable behaviors that markets do not provide.

In the profession of economics, they are known as public goods. Everybody benefits from public goods so nobody will pay for them. If you want them, you have to find them in a public mode. That is why we have public schools. That is why we have, come to think about it, why we have the Marine Corps. These are public goods that you have to provide for in the collective mode.

In 1994, as the Finance Committee was considering the health care legislation sent to us by the administration we found ourselves more and more interested in the question of medical schools. In this new world, who takes care of these special institutions which have high prices? They have high prices because they have high costs. They have high costs because they are teaching.

We had a wonderful exchange and I am sure the chairman recalls it. One morning a witness from Fordham University, an ethicist, Father Charles J. Fahey said, "What I am seeing is the 'commodification' of medicine—a wonderful phrase. The then head of the UCLA Medical Center, Raymond G. Schultze, said at another hearing 'Can I give you an example? In southern California we now have a spot market for bone marrow transplants.'"

All that is something that is to be welcomed. It is happening anyway, going to happen in whatever market for medical care, and we have to provide some nonmarket provisions for these singular institutions, these great teaching hospitals, in the great age of

medical science. In the history of the species it is only in the last 40 or 50 years—40 some say, 50 radicals would say—that medicine has really been able to do something. It is learning exponentially, learning by the hour.

In this situation there can be a surplus of some doctors generally, of some specialists in particular, some judgments need to be made, and this transition needs to be made.

As I understood the legislation, I think the chairman would agree, we were proposing a 5-year transition period to see whether we did not get good results—we will not know in the next 5 years, at least—to save money.

It has a clear and necessary purpose. On both grounds, Mr. President, I rise to join the chairman. First of all this is legislation on an appropriation bill, which we must not have. Secondly, this is a measure that was included in the Balanced Budget Act only just this moment, and it is in response to a real life situation in an open experimental mode. In 5 year's time we will know more, and I plead—this is a subject that will not go away. We will be debating this matter, the matter of teaching hospitals and medical schools on the floor of the U.S. Senate for a quarter century to come.

I join the chairman in proposing that we not approve this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join with the distinguished ranking member and the senior Senator from New York, the ranking member on Finance and the chairman of Finance, the distinguished Senator from Delaware, in opposing the McCain amendment.

Let me say that the rhetoric is rather fascinating, the rhetoric that is used in support of this amendment, that we are paying for something that we are not getting. The fact of the matter is that it totally ignores the reality that teaching hospitals that administer to the poorest of the poor, that provide training for our Nation's doctors, that provide medical services to those who would otherwise in many cases find it difficult to get those services, will actually be saving the taxpayer money as a result of the legislation that has been enacted, a legislation which the amendment that we are now discussing would strike down.

The fact is the Congressional Budget Office as recently as this morning has scored the McCain proposal as one that would cost the Treasury \$350 million. So it is rather disingenuous to say that we are paying for something, in the rhetoric which is used, to suggest that "Government rationing of medical training, ultimately the rationing of health care, smacks of socialism, not democracy" does not recognize the problem that exists.

It costs approximately \$100,000 a year. That is what the Government is paying, for every resident who is em-

ployed at the various hospitals throughout the country. There is a recognition that there is an oversupply. So the Congress, with the administration, developed a format whereby over a period of time, hospitals would reduce the number of doctors and would actually be then saving the Government \$350 million.

Now, if we want to continue business as usual, want to continue subsidizing the oversupply, then we strike this amendment. That is what the Senator would be doing. What he would be doing is absolutely in contravention of what good planning and what good medical practice and what is in the best interests of the taxpayer—allow this amount to gradually go down in the number of doctors who are being trained.

Now, I understand the Senator from Arizona has asked for the ability to debate this measure later in a fuller context and would like an hour equally divided. At that point in time I hope the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, would raise a point of order against the amendment pursuant to section 302(f) of the Budget Act because that point of order, in my opinion, lies, it is proper, and would request a ruling of the Chair. I am not going to do that. I hope we would have the chairman of the Budget Committee review this as to whether or not technically this would cost the taxpayers \$350 million and there is no offset provided.

Now, do we really want to say we want to knock out a program that will reduce the number of doctors and save the taxpayers of this country close to half a billion dollars? That is what the McCain amendment would do, as well-intentioned as it might be. And believe me, I do not question the Senator's intentions. I think he has a legitimate point.

Are we paying for something that we are not getting? I think the fact is we are going to be reducing the supply and we will be saving \$350 million but we are doing it in an orderly manner. We are allowing those who are on the battlefield, those who are providing services for the neediest of the needy, for those who do not have adequate health insurance, those people who would otherwise not receive the kinds of medical services and high quality, they are in our inner core cities throughout our Nation because those are the hospitals in most cases that will be affected, the great institutions in our metropolitan communities throughout this country.

It makes no sense, it seems to me, to knock out a program that will deprive us of the opportunity of seeing an orderly downsizing, and, yes, save taxpayers money at the same time.

I join in opposition to this amendment and I commend the chairman of the Finance Committee from Delaware and my distinguished colleague from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 1076

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I should now like to turn to Amendment 1076, offered by the Senator from Washington. I must oppose this amendment which alters the complexion of the newly created State children's health insurance program. The appropriations bill is simply not the vehicle for reopening the Balanced Budget Act. The amendment raised issues which should be addressed for all States, not just a few. Barely a month has passed since the bill was enacted. This is not the time to reopen the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. President, as reported out of the conference with the House, it is clear that the fundamental purpose of the new \$24 billion children's health program is to expand health insurance coverage for children who do not presently have health insurance.

Under the new children's health program, the Federal Government will increase its share of the cost of providing public insurance in some States by as much as 30 percent. This so-called enhanced match is to act as an incentive to expand coverage to more children. And, indeed, that is what we all expect will happen.

At the same time, we do not want to simply shift new costs to the Federal Government to provide services to individuals who are already covered by insurance whether through the private sector or the public sector. Nor should these funds be used to merely supplant State funds. At the very least, we should try to minimize this from happening.

As the Senate considered the children's health legislation over the summer, it limited eligibility to 200 percent of the Federal poverty level. The Senate was gravely concerned, and rightly so, about the crowding out effect in which public insurance would replace private insurance.

But States which had already expanded eligibility above 200 percent of poverty argued that they would not be able to use their new child health allotment because of this limitation. There would be no children to cover, they argued.

In deference to those States, we agreed to raise the eligibility limit to 50 percentage points above a State's Medicaid standard in the conference with the House. We also provided States with options for participating in the program above their current levels.

The Gorton amendment is not about States expanding coverage for children beyond their current commitment. It is about claiming additional Federal dollars to do what the States have already agreed to do.

This is an important issue which should not be determined after a few minutes of debate on an appropriations bill.

Furthermore, the amendment would create another inequity which should be carefully considered and addressed, if necessary.

The Gorton amendment applies to only a handful of States which have previously expanded coverage to children. The Gorton amendment applies only to those States which have expanded Medicaid at least up to 200 percent of the poverty level and up to age 17. These States are to be congratulated for their leadership. But there are also at least 20 other States which have also expanded Medicaid eligibility, which would not gain the advantage extended by the Gorton amendment.

While the amendment provides the enhanced match for total expansion, it does not provide the same advantage for those States which have made only a partial expansion. For example, a state which has expanded to 185 percent of the poverty level would not be eligible for the enhanced match for new children up to that level.

Creating such inequities illustrates a fundamental problem with using the appropriations process for legislating in place of the authorizing committees. While perhaps a problem might be solved for a few States, that solution might create new inequities among several more States.

If the policies in the new children's health program should be changed, then let us examine the issue in a thorough and complete manner which is equitable for all States. But we cannot and should not attempt to do so today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President—

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ROTH. If the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent that consideration of Senate Resolution 120 begin following the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL LARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise simply and succinctly for the purpose of endorsing the statement by our revered chairman and, once again, to say, as he put it, the ink is scarcely dry on this legislation and here we are changing it. Could it have been 5 legislative days since it was last enacted, and we are changing it?

And, importantly, this is legislation on an appropriations bill. It is not in the interest of our institution to let that begin. It is a lesson we have learned in difficult ways in the 19th century, and we have shown how important it has been in this century. As we approach a new century, it is no precedent to establish.

I believe we will now move to the measure indicated by the Senator from Delaware.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE DEATH OF MOTHER TERESA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report Senate Resolution 120.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 120) expressing the sense of the Senate on the occasion of the death of Mother Teresa of Calcutta.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I am here today to address the resolution introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Oklahoma on Mother Teresa. Last week, we lost a saint when Mother Teresa passed away at age 87. We are poorer, but Heaven is richer.

She died owning, as I have read in the news accounts, very few things here. She owned about two pairs of sandals, three robes, rosary beads. That was here. But in Heaven, she has a mountain of gold. She had touched so many different lives on this Earth. It is an incredible definition of a successful life: a loving, caring, compassionate, selfless, child of God, caring for, in many cases, the most downtrodden of God's children. Would that I could live my life as well.

I have been struck by some of her writings and things that she has spoken about. They have been accumulated in different books. Some of the statements are absolutely precious. I want to give a couple of them here in the Senate today because I think they are so touching of indicative of what a successful life is. A successful day isn't necessarily when you pass a bill in the Senate, or that you have a successful business transaction, or you pass a test, or you win a game. But a successful day is when you positively touch another life. She did that thousands of times, millions of times, across this globe. She cared for the poorest of the poor. She said this at one point in time:

I see God in every human being. When I wash the leper's wounds, I feel I am nursing the Lord himself. Is it not a beautiful experience?

Imagine if each of us, every day, if we saw everything that we did as nursing and touching the Lord himself. Here she is talking about caring for the least of God's children in that way, and she sees it as serving the Lord himself. What about us here in the Senate? If we did something similarly, saw ourselves as touching other lives in the most positive way we possibly could, what sort of world would that make?

Think of another quote that she gave in one of her speeches where she said this:

Our mission is to convey God's love—not a dead God but a living God, a God of love.

And then she added:

I am just a little pencil in his hand.

But what a beautiful picture he drew with that little pencil. What if each of

us looked at ourselves as that little pencil, but being used to draw a beautiful picture, a panorama for others to see and to be able to enjoy, and for others to be able to grow by, for others to be able to be loved by that picture that we draw.

I have this quote posted in my office, which I think particularly is apropos giving her just passing this week:

At the moment of death, we will not be judged by the amount of work we have done, but by the weight of love we have put into our work.

You just think about that in measuring each day, not by the success of whether or not we did things like a bill passing through or, again, whether we passed a test, but by the weight of love that we put into our actions and what we actually did that very day and how we touched people. Did we do it in a positive, loving fashion? Would that the world operated that way.

My own experiences with Mother Teresa were here in the Senate. The only time that I had a chance to meet her was when she came here and received the congressional gold medal this year. We were all nervous about whether she would actually be able to physically get here because she had been ill, in poor health. She was able to make it here and she shared an hour and a half with us here in the House and in the Senate, in the rotunda area, meeting with different people. I remember so much going through that experience and thinking of reading these quotes, these pearls of wisdom she had laid out on how to live life, thinking she was going to put forward another one that day. I was holding onto each word to see, is there going to be another line like "I am just a little pencil that you can guide one's life by." But it didn't seem to come that day. She would talk about a number of different things, but there, seemingly, were no pearls.

Then I remember walking her out to the car, and there were throngs of people excited to see her as she waved and touched different people. The motorcade was waiting to get away. She was sitting in the car, and I went over to thank her one last time for coming in and honoring us by being here and receiving the presentation. She grabbed my hand with both of hers and stared at me with those deep eyes of hers and that little frame that she had, and she looked up at me and just said three words, and she said them four times. She said:

All for Jesus.

We can all have different faiths and views of the world, but that was a driving focus for her, serving her Lord. How she did it each day is a testimony to each of us of how we should live.

We lost a saint, but the tragedy isn't that she died; the tragedy would have been had she never lived. She lived fully and gave us so much in raising our consciousness, lowering our line of sight, and redefining compassion for an entire planet. For that, I thank her and I am thankful for her life. I think we