

likelihood, in the full Appropriations Committee tomorrow.

Madam President, frankly, I see no intellectually honest way to adequately provide for education without breaking the budgetary caps.

I know neither side wants to suggest that the caps be broken. Each side wants the other side to be the first. I have no hesitancy to say how I feel because I am interested in education. I am interested in meeting the needs of the country and meeting the needs of the people. If it cannot be done without breaking the caps, then so be it.

I cannot support these two resolutions, not because I disagree with their intent, but because I cannot voice my support for increasing education funding on the one hand while in the same breath saying that the budget caps cannot be broken. Education is important. If it is important, it is worth breaking the budget caps. And it is. It is worth breaking the budget caps. Budgetary gimmicks that add months to the fiscal year or that take funds from other critical programs like heating assistance for the poor and the elderly will not hold up over time. They are very frail reeds, very weak reeds, to which to cling in the face of hurricane force winds of need.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

#### EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REAUTHORIZING THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

#### TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EDUCATION FUNDING

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. Res. 186 and S. Res. 187, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 186) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

A resolution (S. Res. 187) to express the sense of the Senate regarding education funding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a total of 2 hours debate on the two resolutions under the control of the two leaders.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged against each side.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam President, as I rode to the office this afternoon, I was listening to news accounts which were reporting that the President was making a series of speeches in which he was criticizing the congressional majority and their plans for education and education improvement in this country.

It seemed to me as I listened to the news accounts—assuming they were accurate—the President was basing his criticism on two counts: No. 1, if you did not believe that his priorities in education were the proper priorities, then you did not really value education in this country and you were failing in your commitment to public schools. His second criterion was the amount of money that was going to be spent on public education at the Federal level.

So really two criteria: You have to spend it where he wants to, and you have to spend the amount he desires, or else you have failed in some kind of litmus test as to a commitment to education.

I reject both of those tests. I think, as you look at the amount of money and the increases in funding for education nationally over the last 25 years, you have to conclude that simply spending more money is not the answer to improving education—that that criterion fails. If that is going to be the criterion, well, then, there may be a lot of people who can say they are committed to education but with very little evidence of success or results.

Because we, as Republicans, disagree with the President's particular priorities, which are funding a new program for 100,000 teachers, whether or not that happens to be the great need in a particular area; and increased funding for the construction of schools, though we know there are many dilapidated schools, many schools that are in need of construction, that may or may not be the priority, the great need in a particular area—because we disagree with his priorities and his effort to further nationalize education in this country, he would deem us then as lacking commitment to education.

I believe, with the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act this year, we have a golden opportunity to dramatically improve Federal education programs that for years have not provided a good return for every dollar.

If we are going to spend taxpayers' money on education—and poll after poll indicates that this is a high priority with the American people; it is high on their list of where they believe emphasis should be placed—then I suggest we must hold the States, we must hold school districts, we must hold even individual schools accountable for the funds they are receiving.

In the past, ESEA has not rewarded success nor has it punished failure. Instead, money is allocated only for specific uses, with no results demanded or expected.

For example, we allocate funding for technology in schools, but in no way do

we require schools to show us how this is helping kids to learn. We only require them to use the funding appropriately, but there is no link to the ultimate goal, which is and should be student achievement. In category after category, we find this to be the case. We provide the funds and so long as the States can demonstrate they are spending it appropriately—that is, for the appropriate category—there is no requirement that they demonstrate student achievement.

I believe this system must change. We must allow schools more flexibility in how they use funding to meet their individual needs and show how they are improving student achievement for all students. The bottom line should be, the bottom line must be, in education: Are students learning? Not are we spending more money, not is our funding increasing, not are they meeting a set of regulations that can fill out the forms and demonstrate that they, in fact, have spent technology money on technology, but are students learning, are student achievement scores increasing? That must be the ultimate test.

It is in that area that Federal education programs have abysmally failed. Schools currently receive Federal funding with so many strings attached they cannot effectively use the funding they receive. I believe those strings must be reduced so that the only requirement is the dollars are being spent in the classroom to enable children to learn.

Over the past 34 years, since the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was first passed, it has grown dramatically in size and scope. The Department of Education currently administers 47 K-through-12 programs that are authorized under ESEA. In his fiscal year 2000 budget proposal, the President wanted to create 5 new programs in addition to the 47 currently administered by the Department of Education. I suggest to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the last thing this Congress should do is add 5 new programs to ESEA, when all the evidence is that we are failing in the 47 that currently are authorized.

Diane Ravitch, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and former Assistant Secretary of Education, who has testified on numerous occasions before congressional committees, puts it this way:

At present, American education is mired in patterns of low productivity, uncertain standards, and a lack of accountability. Federal education programs have tended to reinforce these regularities by adding additional layers of rules, mandates, and bureaucracy. The most important national priority must be to redesign policies and programs so that education funding is used to educate children, not to preserve the system.

The proposal from the President to add five new programs to ESEA simply reinforces the status quo. In fact, it expands the existing system which has failed American students so terribly.

A study by the Ohio State Legislature reported that more than 50 percent of the paperwork required by a

local school in Ohio was the result of Federal education programs and mandates, even though the Federal funding in that Ohio district accounted for only 7 percent of the total education spending—7 percent of the funding, 50 percent of the paperwork. I am afraid that is all too typical of what we find with regard to Federal education spending and Federal education programs.

While spending on education has increased, there has been no corresponding rise in academic achievement. According to *Investor's Business Daily*, over the past 25 years, inflation-adjusted, per-pupil spending for grades kindergarten through 12 has climbed 88 percent.

Republicans are not opposed to more education spending. In fact, we have proposed that we dramatically increase education spending. But we believe that simply increasing education spending without a corresponding reform of the system is money ill spent. In Arkansas, total education spending since 1970, adjusted for inflation, Federal, State and local, has grown by almost 58 percent. Since 1970, we have seen in Arkansas a dramatic increase in per-student spending, the expenditures on each child, in the public schools in the State of Arkansas. Unfortunately, overall performance of the average 17-year-old student on the NAEP test changed little between the early 1970s and 1990.

Before we decide the answer to improving our education system is to throw in more money and create more programs, may I suggest we examine closely the programs as we reauthorize them and that we change the current system to allow schools to innovatively use their funding to address their problems as they see fit and as they know best.

Now, in the area of IDEA, funding for disabilities, I think that is an area all of us could agree we have done too little. During the reauthorization of IDEA in 1997, the Federal Government was authorized to pay up to 40 percent of the excess cost of educating special education students. However, the President, who lauds his record on education, has consistently funded special education at only about 10 percent of the excess costs. For fiscal year 2000, the President has requested \$4.31 billion. That is the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1999. This is an area Democrats and Republicans have agreed we have not met our Federal commitment and our pledge to the States and local school districts. Yet the President, who wants to create five new programs, has level funded the area of IDEA.

Reduced funding for special education causes the local school districts to pay the cost of educating children with disabilities. Often these costs, as we all know, can be three to four times the amount spent on other students. Therefore, what is happening is that those local schools are taking money from other programs and other services

because the Federal law requires them to provide that education for special ed students. As a result, they are short-changing other needed educational programs because the Federal Government has failed to meet its commitment.

Another area I think we have failed is in the area of impact aid. The President's fiscal year 2000 budget requests \$736 million for impact aid. That is an increase of \$128 million from 1999. But impact aid provides support to school districts affected by Federal activities, children living on Indian lands and children who live on Federal property who have a parent on active duty in the uniform services. This is one area in which I believe it is very clear that the Federal Government has a role in education. Yet the President's budget does not reflect that priority, that clear responsibility that we have on the Federal level.

Education is mainly a State and local responsibility, where funding is generated from local and State taxes. Yet children who live on Federal lands or on military bases are being cheated out of an equal education. In Arkansas, we have the Ouachita National Forest. We have the Ozark National Forest, the St. Francis National Forest, the Buffalo National River. We have, though many don't realize, because Arkansas is not a far western land, hundreds of thousands of acres in the public domain, school districts that are dependent upon impact aid to fund the educational base because they do not have a tax base upon which they can rely. There is no tax base for these areas.

Any decline in impact aid funding requires State and local school districts to find additional funding to give their children a good education. It is an area that Congress clearly has a role in providing funding. Yet the President continually tries to reduce funding and de-emphasize this priority and this responsibility of the Federal Government. In his budget proposal for fiscal year 2000, the President seeks to increase administrative spending for the Direct Loan Program by \$115 million. That is a 26-percent increase in the Direct Loan Program for administration. Perhaps nothing reflects the misguided priorities of this administration more than their effort to increase administrative spending in a student assistance program by 26 percent.

Adding programs—the wrong priorities in spending—I think reflects the misguided effort of this administration to further nationalize, further remove local control, and, I believe, continue a system that has demonstrated itself to be broken, which has not given us the results students in this country deserve.

They want to promote the Direct Loan Program—there is no doubt about that—and particularly increase the area of administration that is the very area in which we need to be reducing spending. Then in other areas of student assistance, while the maximum

Pell grant award would increase from \$3,125 to \$3,250, total Pell grant funding would be cut by \$241 million. They are particularly important in higher education in States such as Arkansas or any State that has a rural population and a relatively low per capita income.

In Arkansas, that is exacerbated because we have a rather low percentage going on to higher education. The reason for that, many times, is because there is not adequate student assistance available. So while we increase the total amount of a Pell grant, we don't increase—in fact, what would be available is cut in the President's budget dramatically. The result is we have fewer Pell grants available, even though the demand is greater than ever before.

Madam President, let me reiterate my point and my concern about the President's priorities in education and his very ill-timed attacks upon the Republican majority in the House and the Senate. Because we disagree on priorities, his judgment is we are not committed to education. Because we disagree in the amount and where that money should be spent, his conclusion is that we are not committed to education.

I believe Republicans have come forward with one of the most creative, innovative educational priorities since taking control of the House and the Senate: The idea of taking 21 Federal education programs under ESEA and telling the States that, on a cafeteria basis, they can choose which ones of those programs they wish to have consolidated with new flexibility to find creative and innovative solutions at the State and local level. That is what we need to be doing.

But there are those entrenched in the status quo who say: Let's reauthorize what we have been doing; let's put more money into a system that has not given us greater educational achievement. They think that demonstrates greater commitment to our children. I think we do have a golden opportunity this year, and I think the line could not be clearer between those who believe the Federal Government is the solution and those of us who believe we need local control with greater local flexibility, while demonstrating a commitment on the Federal level but giving maximum flexibility for local policymakers to decide how the local issues can be best solved.

I look forward to the education debate in the coming hours and weeks as we conclude this session. I hope that as we reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we will do so in a way that truly demonstrates our love, our commitment, and our concern for the public school students of this country. I look forward to working with Senator GORTON, who has been so active in this whole education area, and Senator FRIST, Senator JEFFORDS, and all on the Education Committee, to fashion an Elementary and Secondary Education Act that will take us

in a new direction and result in higher student achievement, better results, better education, as we compete in a world economy.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. I yield myself 10 minutes of the time on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his eloquent comments. I am honored to be a part of a partnership with him and with the distinguished Senator from Maine, who now occupies the chair, in proposing a set of reforms on the way in which the Federal Government relates to education in the United States that emphasizes student achievement and a higher quality of education, as against a number of categorical programs where school districts become eligible simply by filling out the right forms and spending the money in the way the Secretary of Education tells them to spend the money, without regard to student achievement and without regard to the priorities set by elected school board members and superintendents and principals and teachers and parents all across the United States.

This afternoon, we are going to vote on two distinctly different approaches to education—a proposal by the minority leader and a proposal by the majority leader. The proposal by the minority leader beats a dead horse. It starts from the proposition that we are to reduce the amount of money we spend on education by some 17 percent, when later on this afternoon—at 6 o'clock—the subcommittee in charge of appropriations for education, in fact, will pass an appropriations bill that not only increases the amount of money we spend on common school education in the United States but increases it by more than the amount requested by the President of the United States in his budget. That is a true commitment to education.

The Democratic proposal ignores the proposition that the President's budget, in fact, lessens the amount of money available for special needs students and education for the disabled; that it reduces very substantially the amount of money for impact aid to those school districts that are greatly impacted by a Federal presence in national parks or forests or military installations; in fact, the proposal before us from the minority leader, ignoring the responsibilities the Federal Government has already undertaken in education, simply talks about new programs, the great advantage of which is that they are titled with names either of the President or of present members of the minority party. It does seem to me that even if we are working within the present system, we would be far better off financing those undertakings

which the Congress and the President have already made than by beginning new ones, not particularly requested by the schools themselves, while leaving the financing of past programs to local entities, whether they regard them as the highest priority or not.

But there are, as I think the Senator from Arkansas pointed out, two major differences in the philosophy of education of the two parties exemplified by these two resolutions. First, as I have said, the resolution by the minority leader speaks about a proposal that does not, in fact, exist. It talks about the fact that education spending will be reduced when, in fact, it will be increased by more than the amount the President requests.

Now, the end of that resolution, of course, does say that we should spend more. Interestingly enough, however, it says we should spend more and take it out of other spending programs without breaking the so-called budget caps. That is an interesting proposition but one that would require genuine magic to accomplish. This body has already passed every appropriations bill, except that which includes education. It is on the basis of the passage of those bills that the minority leader comes up with this proposition that we will cut spending for education. I cannot remember a single member of the other party voting and speaking against a single one of these appropriations bills on the grounds that it spent too much money.

As a matter of fact, the great majority of them voted for each one of these bills that brings us into exactly this situation. Yet they state, with alarm, the fact that we would reduce this amount of spending, saying we should not do it; we should spend more money; we should not break the caps; we should take it out of something else—something they have already voted for. Well, we are, in fact, going to increase the amount of money we are spending on education. But we should do it—and this is the second great difference between the two resolutions—in a way that actually improves the quality of education of our young people, measures it in an objective fashion—actual student achievement.

The other side proposes not only more programs that have not dramatically had that impact, but they would like a half a dozen new ones in addition—all categorical aid programs—decided here in Washington D.C., all one-size-fits-all for every school district in the country.

The proposal of the Presiding Officer, myself, and others is a very simple one. We believe the people who spend their lives educating our children, and who have dedicated their lives to educating our children, might just possibly know more about what they need than do Members of this body or bureaucrats in the U.S. Department of Education.

We say, let's take 12, 21, or 24 of these present programs, and let any State which guarantees that it will use that money to improve student grade

achievement do so for a period of 5 years and then be tested on one ground: Have students done better? Is the quality of the education they are getting improved by teachers, parents, principals, superintendents, and school board members who decide priorities? A rural district in Maine or an urban district in Washington or a suburban district in Pennsylvania will obviously have different priorities.

That is our goal, and it is a goal that is finding agreement in our educational establishment, wherever the Presiding Officer goes in her State, or wherever I go in my State, or wherever any of us go. Our schools want to be liberated because it is their goal to provide better educational opportunities for the kids. They think they know what the kids and students need. It is as simple as that.

We are fighting a phony battle today because, in fact, we are going to increase the amount of money available for education. But it will do us little good unless student achievement is increased and improved upon. We can only do that by changing the system and trusting those who have devoted their lives to educating our children with coming up with the right answers by which to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, as I understand it, we are expected to have two votes at the hour of 5:30—on Senator DASCHLE's and Senator LOTT's Sense-of-the-Senate proposals. The time has been divided for those who favor and those who are opposed to the different proposals. I strongly support the Sense-of-the-Senate which has been introduced by Senator DASCHLE and which I am a cosponsor.

The essence of Senator LOTT's proposal is: Resolved that it is the sense of the Senate that this Congress has taken strong steps to reform our Nation's education system, and allows States, local schools, and parents more flexibility and authority over their children's education; and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will enable this Congress to continue its effort to send decision making to States, local schools, and families.

Of course, we are all in support of reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We don't have any dispute over that. I have listened to a good part of the debate. I have yet to hear those other steps enumerated and identified or commented on. The one piece of legislation that we took was what was called ED-Flex. That is basically a modest expansion of what was done under the Democratic Goals 2000 in 1994. Goals 2000 was President Clinton's initiative. At that particular time, the initial ED-Flex gave the Governors the flexibility. We provided some modest increase in the flexibility, and I supported it. But it

doesn't deal with the kind of problems which we are talking about. That is at the heart of this debate and discussion.

I welcome the fact that since the time Senator DASCHLE introduced his resolution that our Republican leader has made a decision to have a mark-up tonight on these education bills. That is real action. This is the kind of encouragement we would like to have—that we have the introduction of the Daschle resolution, and then under evidently the urging of the majority leader, the Committee on Appropriations is going to meet this evening in order to try to indicate the priority education would have in terms of the national budget. That is as much as you could ever hope for in terms of positive action of a Sense-of-the-Senate resolution—real action. We will wait to see how the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate of the United States is going to act.

What brought about the reasons for the Daschle resolution? Quite frankly, what we heard over the course of the afternoon would respond to those facts. The fact is, since the Republicans have taken over leadership in 1995, in the Senate of the United States, we have found that education as a part of the Federal budget has been the last—not the next to the last but the last—appropriations the Congress has considered. We on this side believe it ought to be the first—not the last but the first.

Now we are caught in a situation with the deadline for adjournment is some time at the end of October and there are only 3 or 4 days remaining in the fiscal year. Finally, we have the Republicans saying: All right. We will finally hold an Appropriations Committee meeting on Monday night when the fiscal year starts later on this week, on Friday. We find that unacceptable.

Members over here can talk in generalities about flexibility. They can talk about the makeup of the Pell program and they can talk about administrative costs over in the Department of Education. We are delighted to get into a more detailed discussion about those particular items. But what those on the other side of the aisle haven't answered is why the funding for the education of the young people in this country has been the last priority under the leadership of the Republicans. That is the issue. That is the question.

With all respect to my friend from Mississippi, and with all respect to the many years he went to public school—I admire that and respect it—it doesn't answer that simple question about why, with all the priorities we have in this country, the leadership has placed this as the last priority.

The history of where the Republicans have been with regard to education as a last priority kind of escapes certain facts. This is extraordinary. My good friend from Mississippi said on September 24: Since Republicans took control of Congress, Federal education funding has increased by 27 percent.

Why? Because of President Clinton and because of the Democratic leadership.

You can say: Well, that is an interesting statement, an interesting comment. Show me.

That is exactly what I intend to do. Right over here is a chart that shows what the funding levels have been under the Republicans since 1995.

In 1994, the Democrats lost the election. The Republicans took over the House and the Senate.

What happened in 1995? In 1995, we had a rescission. What is a rescission? A rescission means the House has appropriated money, the President has signed it, but we want to take some of that money back, rarely used in education, and the Republicans did what? What did they do? We have the suggestion our Republican leader is attempting to convey, that they have been the supporters of expanded use of funding in education.

They had a rescission for \$1.7 billion below the bill actually enacted; they asked for a rescission of \$1.7 billion.

In 1996, the House bill was \$3.9 billion below the 1995 final figure—\$3.9 billion below.

In 1997, the Senate bill was \$3.1 billion below the President's request.

In 1998, it was \$200 million below the President's request.

In 1999, the House bill is more than \$2 billion below the President's request.

Those happen to be the facts.

Let me state the time line for passage of these appropriations.

On March 16, 1995, the House rescission bill came to the floor. The Republican leadership could hardly wait to get into office when they sent this bill up to take some of the money back that funded education.

Then we have the omnibus bill in 1996, the last continuing resolution. The funding of that program passed 7 months after the end of the fiscal year.

In 1997, it passed on the last day of the fiscal year.

In 1998, it passed 1 week after the end of the fiscal year.

The agreement for 1999 was passed 3 weeks after the end of the fiscal year.

As we have seen, they have virtually all been the last appropriations. Nothing my friends have stated has disputed that. This is the record of the requests under Republican leadership in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. The reason we find that Federal education funding rose during this period of time is that we had the Government shutdown and our President refused to go along with it. He actually raised it.

For the majority leader now to say, look at what we have done, is a complete distortion and misrepresentation of the facts. They cannot dispute it. Those are the facts.

The reason this was brought into such sharp relief is that last Thursday, the House Appropriations Committee went to work again and finally had their series of recommendations where

they have cut back or effectively eliminated the President's program to go for smaller class sizes. They had agreed on it at the end of the last Congress. In 1998, Congressman GOODLING said how wonderful it was they had gone ahead and reduced class size for 1 year.

Former Speaker Gingrich said:

... a victory for the American people. There will be more teachers and that is good for all Americans. I'm in.

The Republican leader in the House said this will mean more teachers and this is good for all Americans.

We say fine, that is why we want to expand it. The Republican leader said it was good for all Americans; President Clinton thinks it is good for all Americans; the various statistics and figures in the various STAR evaluations for smaller classes in the State of Tennessee indicate children are making progress. Everyone seems to agree—except who? The Republicans in the House Appropriations Committee that zeroed that program out.

I don't hear from the other side why we have the inconsistency, why it is we have in 1998 Republicans saying it is a victory for the American parents and we have President Clinton supporting it, we have the statistics that say smaller class size for grades 1, 2, and 3 are particularly important in terms of children's academic achievement and accomplishment, and now we find the Republicans in the House of Representatives zero it out, eliminate all of the funding for that particular program. We ask, why?

That happened last week. Later, I will review the various studies showing how the smaller class sizes have been important in terms of academic enhancement and achievement. It ought to be self-evident. No one makes this case more passionately and with more knowledge than perhaps the only school teacher in this body, and that is Senator MURRAY of the State of Washington. She has taught and been a member of a school board and can state the difference between having 15, 25, and 30 children in a classroom. We have had the eloquent statements and comments made by the Teacher of the Year, talking about the difference in being able to know the names of the children and the needs of those particular children and being able to take time with those particular children. It is self-evident. We have seen that. But not according to the Republican Appropriations Committee.

We say this is wrong.

We saw other examples. In the program for helping and assisting children to read, we have made some progress in the area of reading—not much, but we have made noticeable progress. We have a long way to go. We know the challenges out there. There have been a variety of different approaches developed. The chairman of our committee, Senator JEFFORDS, has long been committed to this program. A number of Members enjoy the opportunity to read at Brent Elementary School, here in

Washington. We know the importance of children learning to read and how important that program is in terms of their ability to read and in terms of their own academic achievement and accomplishment.

Why in the world would we cut that program way back? It is a matter of priorities. I read Members' comments made on Friday saying: We cannot fund everything; some people—knowing they were meaning this Senator from Massachusetts—want to fund all these programs. The fact is, here is a question of priorities. The debate is about priorities. We are saying education is a No. 1 priority; that is where scarce resources ought to be continued. If there are other priorities, there is a problem, and we have to make a judgment.

But hold this institution accountable for making education the No. 1 priority. We are prepared to do that. We are prepared to call the roll on it. If Members have other priorities they think are more important, they can go along with those and make their judgment.

One of the major achievements of the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act last year was trying to increase the total number of teachers. We don't just need 2.2 million teachers in 10 years; 30 to 40 percent are in retirement at the present time. There is also rising enrollments—447,000 more children started school this year. Some might say we have more teachers, maybe the programs that are working need some help and assistance if we are going to try to help those 447,000 students. What we have found out is one of the important cutbacks was in the program to enhance the additional qualified teachers to be teaching in our schools.

These are the realities. These are the numbers. This was, actually with regard to teaching, 40 percent below the President's request. It is the Teacher Quality Enhancement Program.

We know, even with the President's programs, with 100,000 new teachers, we are not going to be able to do the whole job. The record-high enrollment this year of 53.2 million students—447,000 more children than last year, and the continued rise over the next ten years; 324,000 in 2000, by 282,000 in 2001, by 250,000 in 2002, and continuing on an upward trend in the following years. I do not hear any discussion about: Look, there is an expanding number of students in our schools in this country. How are we going to ensure we will have sufficient teachers who will be qualified; not people who will be in the classroom but well-qualified teachers? That is what we are strongly committed to.

I see my friend and colleague from Illinois who, I am sure, wants to address the Senate. These are questions of priorities. As I have said before, allocating the resources is a question of priorities. Money does not solve all of the problems. But one thing we do know, without resources you are not

going to be able to invest in the children of this country—you are not going to be able to do it. We believe this is an indication of a nation's priorities. Not all the programs are going to work perfectly. Some may be altered or changed. We will look forward to the debate on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is the principal instrument to help and assist the local schools.

Their answer to the question of priorities is suggesting we should give first priority to helping and assisting families in this country in the partnership—and it is a partnership—between the local communities and the States and the Federal Government. We provide very little, 7 cents out of every dollar. This idea we are making these decisions that will decide all education policy—we understand where the education responsibility is, it is locally. They put up the majority of resources in it. But we provide some targeted resource to try to make a difference in specific areas. That is what we believe in.

We cannot support this concept that the Congress has taken strong steps. Look at the record: Nothing this year for more teachers or smaller classes; nothing to modernize schools, to help with repairs, to wire the schools for computers; nothing to help train teachers; nothing to help with the basic skills such as literacy—virtually nothing. Virtually nothing. All we have seen so far are cuts in education. That is not strong steps to reform our Nation's education system.

I will be glad to yield 10 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts, not only for his statement but also for his leadership on this issue. I do not think there is another Member of Congress, let alone the Senate, who could rival his commitment to education over the years.

I am happy it has come to this vote because I think between these two resolutions—one offered by the Republican majority leader, Mr. LOTT, and one offered, as well, on the Democratic side, an alternative by the Democratic minority leader, Senator TOM DASCHLE—we see a difference in approach and a difference in attitude when it comes to education.

It is curious, as the Senator from Massachusetts has noted, that we have left the education issue for last. After we have talked about every other appropriations bill, some 12 other bills, we are finally going to get around to talking about education. Our human experience tells us we usually leave to last the thing we do not want to do. But why in the world would this Congress not want to deal with education? What is our reluctance to deal with an issue which, on a Republican, Democratic, and independent basis, is judged to be the No. 1 issue in America today? The No. 1 issue with American families is dead last when it comes to Senate consideration.

We are only a few days away from the beginning of a new fiscal year. I will be very honest and concede that rarely, if ever, does Congress have all of its work done on time so we start October 1 with all the new spending bills. But I can never recall a time in the 17 years I have served on Capitol Hill when Congress has been in such utter chaos as we approach October 1.

If the Republican leadership has some master plan they have been holding back on how we are going to meet our responsibilities and do the right thing for the American people, I hope they will unveil it in the next 4 days because October 1 is Republican Responsibility Day. The leaders in Congress, Republican leaders, are responsible for, at a minimum, telling the American people what their plan is so we do not have another horrendous Government shutdown and we meet the priorities on which the vast majority of American families agree.

I look at these two resolutions on education and I can clearly tell there is a difference of opinion between the two political parties about an issue where there should be so much common ground. First, Senator LOTT's S. Res. 186—I assume it will be the first one voted on, but whether it is or not, it is interesting to note Senator LOTT goes through and recounts some of the things that have been done in funding education and finds many shortcomings with our public education system. Ninety percent of the children in America go to public schools, 10 percent to private schools and home schools, and I concede in many public school districts and systems there are schools and classes and teachers that, frankly, should be better. I think we ought to strive for accountability when it comes to education but also for a commitment to education from this Nation.

I think Senator LOTT, however, overlooks some of the more important progress that has been made in public education. I note that student achievement on a nationwide basis is definitely improving. Average reading scores have increased from 1994 to 1998 in all grades tested—4, 8, and 12. It is interesting to me the Republican Party generally opposes the idea of national testing so schools can be held accountable. They think this is all local and it should be done locally, though the students, when they graduate, are going to compete far beyond their localities, probably their States, and maybe nationally or globally. But when we look at these tests we find things are getting better.

We have seen student access to modern computers increasing significantly, and we know the partnership we have been striving to establish between the Federal Government and local school districts has improved reading scores in many districts. In my home State of Illinois, which I am honored to represent in the Senate, we have done remarkable things in the public school

system. A system written off by Secretary of Education William Bennett a few years ago has now become a model for the Nation. It is because of a partnership—Federal, State, and local partnership. There is nothing inherently wrong with that. In fact, we are proving, in Chicago, that partnerships can make a difference.

So when Senator LOTT, in his resolution, says Congress has to recognize the need for significant reform in light of troubling statistics, I think this is clearly a case where we are either going to light a candle or curse the darkness. In Senator LOTT's situation I am afraid the candle isn't lit.

What we have in the resolution, in the "resolved" clause, which is where you get down to business, very little is said. Let me read it to you. This is Senator LOTT's Republican resolution:

... it is the sense of the Senate that—this Congress has taken strong steps to reform our Nation's educational system and allowed States, local schools and parents more flexibility and authority over their children's education. . . .

And he goes on in the second paragraph:

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will enable this Congress to continue its efforts to send decision making back to States, local schools, and families.

What a contrast with the resolution that is being supported by Senator KENNEDY and offered by Senator DASCHLE which, for two pages, goes into specific detail as to what this Congress needs to do before we go home if we are going to be able to face families across America and say: Yes, we get the message. Education is critically important.

In the Daschle Democratic resolution, unlike the Republican resolution, he speaks out specifically for us to reduce class sizes so teachers in the early grades can pay more attention to kids who need a helping hand; to increase support for the development and training of professional teachers, and that is something we know we will need as teachers are retiring and as school enrollments continue to work.

More afterschool programs, an issue I feel very strongly about. We can lament violence in our schools; we can lament juvenile crime; but if we do not invest money in afterschool programs, it is easily understood why these problems get worse instead of better.

An increase, and not a decrease, in funding for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994.

An increase in funding so kids who come from the toughest neighborhoods and families with the most problems have a chance to succeed.

More money for kids who are disabled, so they will have a chance to prove themselves.

More money for Pell grants. Boy, if you are a parent who has sent any of your kids through college, you understand what kids coming out of college face: A diploma in one hand and the

equivalent of a mortgage in the other; \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000 for a bachelor's degree. If we do not accept the commitment that Senator DASCHLE challenges us to accept, these kids will have more and more debt when they graduate. That is clearly something we do not want to see.

We want to make certain that kids, particularly from working families, come out of the college experience and are able to take a good job and not worry, first and foremost, about paying back their school loans which have greatly increased in size.

The Daschle resolution calls for more money for technology in classrooms; also, that the school facilities be modernized. We have seen too many schools that are ramshackle and falling down.

What a clear difference between the Daschle resolution, which speaks in specific terms about the challenges ahead in education, and the resolution offered by Senator LOTT, who is now on the floor, which points, I guess, with some pride, to passing the Ed-Flex bill, which I supported, but says, I guess, in a way, that Congress has already taken strong steps. I think the steps taken by Congress can be a lot stronger and more specific. As we face Responsibility Day, October 1, just a few days away, the question most American families will ask us is, Have we addressed education?

I will close with this thought. At this moment in our history, with our economy the strongest, many say, that it has ever been, with more people, particularly in high-income categories, realizing more income and a better quality of life, with the general economy having weathered, endured, and experienced the most prosperous decade in our history, at a time when we are talking about a surplus in our Federal Treasury when only a few months ago we talked about deficits, at a time when the majority party, the Republican Party, has said, we have so much money in Washington, we have to give \$792 billion away in a tax cut primarily to wealthy people, I have to say: Before we do that, let's get things right when it comes to education. I want to say to the American people: We got the message; we will start the 21st century committed to education to make sure the American century, the 20th century, is followed by the next American century, the 21st century.

We will not achieve that by holding to the standards suggested in S. Res. 186. It is weak soup. Instead, we should be dealing with Senator DASCHLE's resolution which calls on this Congress in specific terms to meet its obligation not only to the families across America and the voters who sent us here but the future generations who count on us to be prepared to put education as our highest priority.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. DURBIN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator was going over 1995 through 1999, does the

Senator remember when it was the standard Republican position to abolish the Department of Education? I think you and I want every time that President meets with his Cabinet officials one person who is going to think nothing but education, and every time that President talks about national priorities, to speak for the education of the children of this country. That I know has been the position of the Senator from Illinois.

Does the Senator understand why, on the one hand, they were going in that direction and then, within about a year after that, we had Secretary Lamar Alexander's answer in terms of the elementary and secondary school reform: That we have a model school in each congressional district and in each of the States, and they to be decided, by whom? By the local community? No; by the Secretary of Education.

Now we have another approach. We have the block-grant approach. Can the Senator explain to me, within a period of about 5 years how we can go from, on the one hand, abolishing the Department of Education to, on the other hand, having the Secretary of the Department of Education saying we ought to have model schools in each of the congressional districts, to now block granting everything and sending it back to the States?

Mr. DURBIN. It is a curious thing, I respond to the Senator from Massachusetts, that the Republican Party—and I believe it might have been in the party platform; it certainly has been a position taken by many of their prominent Presidential candidates that we should abolish the U.S. Department of Education and, in abolishing that Department of Education, give back responsibility for education to the local school districts and families.

The local school districts and the families should have the premier voice when it comes to educational decisions. But we should not overlook the fact, as the Senator from Massachusetts notes, that there are responsibilities we in Washington should accept. And one of those responsibilities is to gauge the demands of the global economy and to make certain that, as a nation, we are moving forward with the kind of educational system in general that will prepare kids for the future.

I have yet to run into a school district in my home State of Illinois that does not want to have Federal assistance in meeting that responsibility. I concur with the Senator from Massachusetts that the Daschle resolution really deals with that in specific terms. The Lott resolution, unfortunately, does not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I did speak at length on Friday afternoon on this issue of education. I will not repeat everything I said then. I do have a unanimous consent request I want to



make momentarily. First, I will make some opening remarks.

I am the son of a schoolteacher. I went to public schools all my life. So did my wife. So did my children. I care a great deal about quality education, public education, private and parochial education. I will take no backdoor approach to education. We have to have quality education in America. It also has to be safe and drug free.

There is a fundamental difference about how we do that. The Democrats think the answer is here in Washington, that nameless and faceless bureaucrats in Washington, DC, know better what should be done in education in Bangor, ME, or Pascagoula, MS. I reject that. I have faith in the students, the teachers, the parents, the administrators, the local officials, and the State officials to do what is right for education.

I may or may not have been right on some educational issues over the years. I voted for a separate Department of Education. I voted for it. I do not want too much revisionist history to be made this afternoon. When I was in the House of Representatives, I did that, and I took a pounding for it. My constituents did not agree with me. They did not think we needed a separate Department of Education. I argued at the time that it was being overrun and overwhelmed by the Department it was in, HEW—Health, Education, and Welfare. It was blocked by the other two issues and did not get the attention it should have. I did that.

I must say, I do not see where a separate Department of Education has done a whole lot of good for education in America. The education scores have continued to go down, although recently some of the test scores may have gone up.

When my children finished high school, I felt they did not have as good an education as I did when I finished high school in Pascagoula, MS. By the way, they went to two of the best high schools in America: Thomas Jefferson High School in Northern Virginia and Annandale High School in Northern Virginia. Yet when they got to the University of Mississippi, even though they had been to the public schools of Fairfax County, they did not have as good a background and preparation for college as some of the students in Biloxi, MS.

What is going on here? I have been through this education thing for a long time. I feel strongly about it. We must have a better education system in America. What we have is not working. What the Democrats are advocating is the same old thing in the same old box. It will not work. We have to come up with different ideas, new ideas.

I repeat one example I went through last Friday. Why is it that elementary and secondary education in America is way down the list of elementary and secondary education programs of the world? I have seen some statistics where we are 17th, and yet higher edu-

cation is rated the best in the world. How can that be, that elementary and secondary education is not what it should be and higher education is excellent?

I have a couple suggestions for you. One, when you finish high school in America, you have a choice of where you go. You can go to work, if you have been in a vocational education program in high school; you can go to a community college or junior college, a technology training program or job training program; you can go to a college, a university, a State university; you can go to a parochial university; or you can go, Heaven forbid, to Harvard if that is what you choose. Every student in America, everyone who finishes high school, can get a college education—with scholarships and loans.

I was a beneficiary of what was then known as the NDEA loan. When my own family fell apart, I was trying to get a law degree. I held down two jobs and got an NDEA loan, thank the Lord. It helped me get an education. I am for loans. You also have grants and supplemental grants. With the combination of jobs and the Work-Study Program—jobs, grants, loans, scholarships—you can go to school.

Every student may not be able to go to Harvard. Some may have to go to local community college where, by the way, you can get a great education. The community college system in America is fantastic. You have a choice, but not if you are in high school. If you live in a middle school district in a neighborhood, you have to go to the middle school in that neighborhood. If it is no good it does not make any difference. It does not make any difference if it is drug infested. It does not make any difference if it is violence prone. You have to go there, even though there might be a good quality public school right down the street.

Right here in the District of Columbia, you have some good high schools. Yet, if the parents want their children to go or the students themselves want to go to a good high school, they are told: No, you can't do that. That does not seem fair. Some of the teachers union people say: Well, the bad schools might not make it. Right. If the school is not doing its job, then get out of the way. Choice is one of reasons we have much better higher education in America.

The other one is financial aid, because if you want to go to college, you get a loan. But you do not get a loan if you want to help your sixth-grade student get a computer or if you want to help them with some of their other needs. You cannot have a Coverdell A+ savings account for elementary and secondary education. Oh, no. No, we can't have that. They might choose to save their money and put their students in some other school.

So I think we need to think about those differences in how we can improve education overall.

Also, I want to make this point. There is talk about, oh, how Republicans are going to starve education. That is total baloney. In fact, in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill that will be on the floor this week, the Republicans have a half a billion dollars more for education than the President's budget—surprise, surprise. How could that be? As a matter of fact, in recent years—I will give the statistics here in a moment—Republicans have provided for a 27-percent increase for education.

We are not stingy on education. We want education to have the money it needs. We don't want it to be able to waste money on programs, but we want to do it differently. We don't want it to be eaten up here in Washington, DC, where the bureaucracy takes a bite out of it, and a little dribbles down to Atlanta, and a little dribbles down to Jackson, and eventually it gets down to where the student is. No.

We say we have faith in the local and State governments and the teachers, the administrators at the local level. We would like it to go down to where the rubber meets the road. Let them make the choices. If they want to put that money into computers, great. If they want to put it into elementary education, or if they want to put it into remedial reading or remedial math, or if they want to fix a roof, great.

Of course, the answer again for the Democrats is, we should get into the school building business; the Federal Government should start being in charge of repairing local school building roofs, by the way, at a time when every State in the Nation—every one—has a surplus.

Every State has a surplus, and some people say: Well, it might be a few dollars—\$34 billion. So how about local and State governments being in charge of building schools? If we start down that road, if we start being in charge of the roofs and building the buildings at the Federal level, we will have to build every one in America. I think once again it will bring more control to Washington, and we should be directing it the other way.

I would like to ask consent to add a modification to our resolution we have pending. I do now ask unanimous consent that the pending resolution be modified with changes I send to the desk.

Before the Chair rules, let me say to the Senate, these are modifications regarding the vetoed tax bill and all the education benefits that bill would have extended to the American people if it had been signed into law by the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, we just received these changes. There was an initial presentation, a Lott resolution. Then that was changed on Friday, which was fine. Now this is an additional one. At this time, I would have

to reserve the right to object just so we would have an opportunity to read it and familiarize ourselves with it. So I object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I thank the Senator for putting it in a reservation in that way. He would like to have a chance to read it over.

This is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. The Democrats are stating their sense of the Senate on education issues. We have our resolution, and we would like to do the same thing. So I hope they will review the language we have in this modification and agree that it could be added to our resolution. But in the meantime, let me state what is in this resolution.

So here is the untold story. This modification, that may be objected to, would simply spell out what was in the tax cut bill the Republicans passed—the Congress passed and sent to the President, and he vetoed it. What has not been told is that there were a lot of education benefits in that bill.

In fact, it was interesting to me that 1 day after the President vetoed that bill, providing considerable new incentives for education, the Democrats complained about this Congress' performance on education. But they raised not a single voice to protest the unwise veto when you take into consideration the tremendously enhanced education for millions of Americans that was included in that bill.

The President's veto denies 14 million American families from participating in the education savings accounts—that is what I was referring to a while ago—to allow parents to save for their children's education needs at the elementary and secondary level, which they cannot do now. These accounts would have generated \$12 billion for parents to provide tutors, pay for books, buy computers, send children to afterschool instruction, and pay for tuition at private schools if their public school failed to make the grade. Twenty million Americans children would have benefited, but the President said no to that.

The President's veto denies 1 million students savings to make college more affordable. Our bill would have provided 1 million students in-State prepaid tuition plans. And my State of Mississippi is one of those; I think the State of Maine may be one of those, and a number of other States. They are being denied this prepaid tuition plan which would provide significant tax relief to make college more affordable.

Why shouldn't parents be able to save in advance for their own children's college tuition? The financial crunch for college would be eased for 1 million students, but the President said no.

The President's veto denies 1 million workers receiving education assistance through their employers. This is something that I believe the Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN, has advo-

cated for years. In today's competitive economy, education is the key to maintaining skilled workers. One million American workers would have had access to better education or more education, but the President said no.

The President has made college more expensive for millions of Americans. The Taxpayer Relief and Refund Act would have allowed recent college graduates to deduct the interest on their student loans. I would have liked to have had that when I graduated. For my own NDEA loan, the interest rate was not that high then, but it would have helped in paying that loan back. This provision is particularly critical for young people trying to hold down their first job and paying off their college debt at the same time. College would have been more affordable for millions of American students, but once again the President said no.

The American people would have benefited also by the help given in this bill to schoolteachers. Our bill allowed every elementary and secondary school teacher in America to receive tax relief for their professional development expenses.

My mother taught the first grade through the sixth grade but generally first grade. This is something that would have been helpful to her when she was teaching those 19 years. This bill would have made professional development less expensive, but the President said no; that, once again, the teachers should not have this benefit.

So I wanted to point out several educational features that are in this bill. All I am trying to add to our resolution is this information so people will be aware of it.

With regard to our commitment to education, in the bill that will be coming to the floor—and in bills that have come to the floor in recent years—we have raised the Pell grant funding for our Nation's poorest students to historically high levels. We have increased funding for our Nation's disadvantaged schoolchildren, thanks to the leadership of Senator GREGG of New Hampshire and others. And we have raised the funding by \$2 billion over the last 3 years for IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Our commitment to our Nation's disabled children certainly outstrips the President, who recommended funding levels this year that do not even keep pace with inflation. Funding for education has increased by 27 percent since 1994. We will continue moving forward. We will continue to provide adequate funding for education. We will continue to work for innovative ways to improve education, and we will have a bill on the floor this very week that puts money where our mouths are. We are not interested just in saying what the President didn't do or what the Democrats didn't do. We are interested in getting the job done. That may mean doing some things differently from the way they have been done in the past.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. How much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventeen minutes 37 seconds.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think, going forward with this debate, there ought to be some facts pointed out for clarification because the resolution of the Democratic leader and the representations of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Illinois are not consistent with the facts, as they are presently in existence and on the ground.

Specifically, the Republican budget included a dramatic increase for education, and the mark for education under the Labor-HHS bill, which is being marked up this evening, represents a \$2.2 billion increase over last year; no reduction, a \$2.2 billion increase.

Let me go through a few of these programs that have been represented by the other side as being reduced. That is misinformation. It is inaccurate, and it is really inappropriate, that the Democratic leader would bring to the floor of the Senate a resolution which is so totally and grossly inaccurate.

In the area of Pell grants, the committee will be marking up a bill which has a \$74 million increase over last year's funding; that represents a number of \$7.7 billion. In the area of IDEA, the committee will be marking up a bill which has a \$701 million increase over last year's funding; that represents a number of \$5.8 billion. In the area of IDEA part B, the committee will be marking up a bill which has a committee increase over last year's funding of \$678 million, a total budget of \$4.8 billion. In the area of the TRIO Program, the committee will be marking up a budget which has a \$30 million increase over last year's spending, \$630 million.

In the area of title I, the committee will be marking up a budget which has a \$324 million increase over last year's budget, a number of \$8.7 billion for title I. In the area of the safe and drug-free schools, the committee will be marking up a budget which has an increase of \$45 million over last year, a total number \$611 million. In the area of Head Start, the committee will be marking up a budget which has a \$608 million increase over last year, total budget of \$5.2 billion.

In the area of afterschool programs, the committee will be marking up a budget which has a \$200 million increase over last year. When you add these increases up, we are significantly above the administration request.

For example, in the Pell grant area, we are \$315 million over the administration request. In the IDEA area, we are \$375 million over the administration's request. In the IDEA part B area,



we are \$675 million over the administration's request. In the title I area, we are \$16 million over the administration's request. In the safe and drug-free schools area, we are \$20 million over the administration's request.

The simple fact is, the representations put forward in this resolution by the Democratic leader are absolutely inaccurate. It is inappropriate that this has not been amended to reflect the markup vehicle which is going forward in the Senate. Maybe the Democratic leader thinks he represents the House of Representatives, not the Senate. In the Senate, these are the numbers we are working from, dramatic increases in funding and a commitment to programs we think are working.

Yes, there are significant differences on priorities. As both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Massachusetts have said, their priorities are different than our priorities. That is true. There is a different philosophy of government, a different philosophy of approach to education.

We happen to believe parents should be empowered. We happen to believe teachers should be empowered. We happen to believe principals should be empowered. We happen to believe local school boards should be empowered to make decisions as to how they operate their schools and where they will put their scarce and valuable resources.

The other side of the aisle happens to think they have the best ideas in the world, that all the good ideas come from the national labor unions and from the Department of Education and from the administration; that, therefore, there should be developed a set of categorical grants which will tell the parents, the teacher, and the principal exactly how they will run their local school because Washington absolutely knows better how to do it than the local parents, the teacher, or the school.

Well, there is the difference. No question about it. The other side wants to set up a categorical program in the area of buildings, in the area of after-school programs, in the area of teacher ratio. What we want to do is say to the local school district, to the parents, to the teacher, and to the principal: Here are the dollars. We tell you you must set a standard of education which is an excellence standard, a standard which requires that the children in your school meet the basic elements of education—math, reading, and writing. You have to have those standards. But within the context of meeting those standards, which standards shall be set at the State, not by us in Washington—we don't believe in national tests because we don't happen to think people here in Washington should write the tests; we think people in the States should write the tests—once those standards are set at the local school district by the States, then we say to the States, local school districts, parents, and teachers: You make the decision on where the dollars should be.

Should they be in a new classroom or with an additional teacher, or maybe there are some schools out there that happen to want another computer, that happen to want to have another French teacher, that want to have another math teacher, or maybe they want to send their kids to some special program. Maybe they have some new concept of education they think is going to work better.

Leave it to the local school district to make that decision. Leave it to the parent to make that decision. Leave it to the principal and the teacher to make that decision. Let us not make those decisions in Washington.

Yes, there are priority differences. Our priority is to empower the parent, the teacher, and the principal. Their priority is to empower the national labor unions, the Department of Education, and the great thinkers in Washington who have the answers to everything on every subject and especially on the issue of education.

We have, in the proposals we will be putting forward, specific programs which do empower parents, which give parents a chance to do something when their kids are in schools that fail. It is an outrage that in this Nation we have 5,000 high schools and elementary schools combined that are failing schools, by the standards set by the people who run those schools. If you have your kids in those schools, what is your option? You don't have an option. Your kid is stuck in that school.

Parents ought to have an option. If their children are in a school that has failed year after year after year after year to teach those children how to write, how to read, how to think, parents shouldn't have to be subjected to sending their kids to those schools. They should have the opportunity to say to that school: OK, we are going to give you 2 years to clean up your act—which is exactly what our proposal does—on your standards. We are not setting the standards. We will not set a bar so high that nobody can reach it. You get to set the standards—you, the State; you, the community.

If that school doesn't meet those standards—and I suspect those standards are going to be reasonably stringent; at least they are in New Hampshire—so that an elementary school, once again, for 2 years in a row fails, then we basically put that school on probation. We say to the State: You have to go into that school and you have to straighten it out. You have 2 years to do that. You have 2 years to get those kids an education, which is what the goal is, obviously.

If after 2 more years that school still doesn't cut it, then we say to the parents of the kids who are going to be subjected to this horrendous school: It is up to you. You make the decision as to whether you want your son or daughter to go to that school. If you decide you want your son or daughter to go to another public school or to another program that involves after-

school activities and you are a low-income person, we are going to let the funds go with your child. We are going to let the funds follow your child rather than have that school absorb all these funds that will do nothing for you in the way of educating your children. That is a difference of opinion. They want to run the failed schools, keep sending money to the failed schools, and they want to build more failing schools.

We say if a school is failing, let's get it under control and make it work; if it doesn't work, let's give the parents some options. We also say: Listen, we have all these categorical programs that almost tell teachers how many pencils they can have in their classrooms. Let's stop that and take a bunch of these categorical programs and put them into a basket of money, and after setting the standards—again, the standards are set by the State, not by us—after setting the standards, say to the local school districts: You can use this basket of money to try to help your kids make the standards. It is called "straight A's." Every school district in this country is for it. The only people against it are the big labor unions in Washington and the Department of Education because they don't want to give up the categorical programs. Why? Because there is political power in those programs. This isn't about education; this is about power, about controlling dollars for the sake of power.

We are talking about getting money out to the parents; they are talking about empowering a bunch of people in Washington who happen to be affluent in their field or effectively are elitists, in my opinion. So, yes, there are differences of philosophy. But on the facts, this resolution carries no weight because it is totally inaccurate on the facts. It should be amended because every one of these cuts it lists is not a cut at all.

While we are on the subject of cuts, who does make the most significant cut at the Federal level? Is it the Republicans? No, it is not. It is the President's budget, sent up here without any increase in spending for the IDEA program, the special ed program. Let's talk about that a little bit because there is a difference in priorities. Special ed is a very important part of education, a good idea put together back in 1976 under 74-142 or 76-142—I am not sure which; there are so many numbers floating around. But it said, if you have a special needs child, that child has the right to a good education in the educational system, and the Federal Government knows it is going to cost a lot to educate that child, so the Government will pay for 40 percent of the cost of that child's education.

What happened? While the Democrats controlled this Congress, year in and year out, that 40-percent number went right down like a roller coaster going down a big hill. The Federal Government's share of education was down to

6 percent when the Republicans took control of the Senate and the House. We recognized that was wrong. What happens when we don't pay the special needs cost is the dollars flow from the local community, who takes over the Federal responsibility, and then the local community no longer has flexibility over the local dollars because they are paying for what the Federal Government was supposed to do in the first place.

(Mrs. HUTCHISON assumed the chair.)

Ms. COLLINS. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. GREGG. I will certainly yield to the Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. So what the Senator is saying is it has been the Republican Congress that has attempted to live up to the promise made in funding special education; it has been the Republican Congress, and, today, the Appropriations Committee is going to meet to add educational dollars to the President's budget. In fact, we will be increasing spending for essential programs such as special ed, Pell grants, the TRIO programs, above what the President has requested; am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. GREGG. The Senator is absolutely correct. Regarding IDEA, the President, all during his term in office, has never sent up a budget of any significance. However, the Republican Senate and Congress have increased IDEA funding by over 85 percent and, after this year, there will be up to about a 110-percent increase in it over the baseline with which we started.

Ms. COLLINS. If I may, I will ask the Senator from New Hampshire, who has been such a leader on education issues, one further question. So this is not a debate about money because it has been the Republicans who have continually increased educational funding. What this is a debate about is who is going to make the decisions. This is a debate about philosophy. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. GREGG. That is exactly right. It is about philosophy and it is about power.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GREGG. The Senator from Maine has been a leader on education issues, also, especially IDEA.

To complete my thought on that issue, the President sent up a budget which had no increase in IDEA. He took the money from the special ed kids and he started these new categorical programs—buildings, afterschool, teachers. That money should have gone to special ed to fulfill the obligation of the 40 percent we said we were going to pay in the first place. But, no, he took the money from the IDEA program and put it into the categorical programs, which had the double, insidious effect of making the local governments have to now support the Federal programs, so they lose their local schools. They could have built schools if they wanted to build schools or added teachers or

done whatever they wanted to. Now they don't have the dollars because they are supporting IDEA.

On top of that, he says to the local school districts: I have taken your dollars for special ed, which we were supposed to pay you to begin with, and I put them in categorical programs; to get the dollars, you have to do what I tell you to do—build a school, or add a teacher, or you have to do an afterschool program. The local school district may not want to do that; they may want to do something else, such as a new French program, or a new computer system. They may want to add to the football team, or put in an arts department. But they can't do it because the money they were going to have to do that with is being spent to do the Federal end of the special ed funds. Now the money that is supposed to come in for that is coming into a categorical grant.

It is all about power and who is going to run the education system. Is it going to be run in Washington by labor union leaders and bureaucrats, or is it going to be run by the teachers, parents, and the principals? That is what this debate is about; it is not about money.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 8 minutes.

Madam President, a couple of quick facts. If the good Senator from New Hampshire went back to March 25 of this last year—the time we were considering the \$790 billion tax cut—we offered an amendment that would have taken one-fifth that amount of money and completely funded IDEA. The Republicans unanimously rejected it. They unanimously rejected it. They thought we ought to have tax breaks rather than funding IDEA. So, before we get all worked up about this position that was just talked about, we ought to understand that.

Madam President, with all respect to my friend, the majority leader, I don't find traveling around Massachusetts that the school systems are saying: We have sufficient resources and we don't need any help or assistance. The role of the Federal Government, historically, is to provide a very limited amount of resources in targeted areas, where there are some special needs, and that is why we have these targeted resources.

If our good friends on the other side want to have a good deal more funding, generally, in terms of education, they can request their Governors to go ahead and do so. Our role is to find targeted resources.

Now, what are these targeted areas we have talked about? Let's get specific. One of the key areas are smaller class sizes. As I mentioned, the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, is our leader on that issue. The project STAR

studied 7,000 students in 80 Tennessee schools. Students in small classes performed better than students in large classes in each grade from kindergarten through third grade. Follow-up research shows that gains lasted through at least the eighth grade. STAR students were less likely to drop out of high school. Research also shows that STAR schools and smaller classes in grades up from K through 3 were between 6 and 13 months ahead of regular classes in math, reading, and science, all the way through the fourth, sixth, and eighth. That is one of the programs that we support. That is a priority item. The Republicans zeroed that out.

I was interested in the Republican leader saying we are going to have a big bill on the floor of the Senate next week. We are saying: Where has it been? We are glad it is going to be here, but where has it been? That is our point.

We have the situation of after-school programs. We know the dangers of young students getting in trouble with violence after school. Juveniles are most likely to commit violent crimes after school, as this chart shows, it is between 3 and 6 p.m.

We had a modest program by the President with \$200 million. There were 1,700 applications for that program. Only 184 programs can be funded at the current level of \$200 million. There were 1,800 unfunded after-school programs. We are trying to fund those. The Republicans say no.

Take a look at what these dollars have meant in terms of math scores improving. This is in the neediest areas of this country. From 1992 to 1996, in every one of these areas, and particularly in the areas where the students are the poorest, almost double the performance for children in the area of math and science. In each of the various quarters, we have seen a significant increase in the last 4 years.

That is our priority: Smaller class size, after-school programs, and trying to improve student achievement in the areas of math and science.

I'll mention one more area, wiring the schools for the 21st century. We have seen the gradual increase in the schools that are wired. But still, for the instructional rooms where children learn, they do not have those kinds of resources. We believe we should provide some help and assistance. Local school districts want that help and assistance. We are being denied that under the Republican priorities.

Finally, with all respect to our majority leader, the history and the record shows that it has been this President and the Democratic leadership who have seen the increase in the funding over the period of the last 6 years. That is just a matter of record, with all respect.

The final point the Republican leader says: Why didn't they support our tax reductions? The Office of Management and Budget has stated that there would have been a 40-percent reduction in

support of education in order to pay for that tax break.

I ask the majority leader, if you have \$780 billion that you want to give away in tax breaks, why aren't you providing additional funding on programs that have been tried, tested, and have enhanced the educational achievement of the children of this country?

Madam President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I will use leader time so as not to take what limited time may be left.

I want to speak for a moment and commend the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his remarks and for the incredible message I think that chart alone points out.

We heard our Republican colleagues say over and over that they are the ones who have supported education; they are the ones who can take credit for the fact that we have actually improved funding over the course of the last several years. As Senator KENNEDY has pointed out so ably, it is only because we have forced our Republican colleagues to increase this investment that we see any real improvement whatsoever.

That is the reason I am hoping our colleagues will be very wary of the resolution posed by our Republican colleagues this afternoon.

Obviously, if you look at some of the stated priorities, there is very little for which there can be disagreement. We should have well-trained, high-quality teachers. Parents need to be involved in education of their children. There have to be safe schools, and we need to have orderly places for children to learn.

But the problem is the rhetoric and the record are totally opposite. Rhetoric is what we just heard. The record is deep cuts in education every single year. The Republican agenda will not achieve the rhetoric that the resolution the Republicans are proposing today calls for.

Look again at what the House Labor-HHS-Education subcommittee did last week. How does killing class size reduction match the rhetoric in the resolution? How does it match the rhetoric in the resolution to provide only half of the money the President has requested for afterschool programs? How can you ensure that we have orderly places for children to learn when you cut funds from the Safe and Drug Free School program? How do we help make sure children are ready to school when you provide \$500 million less for the Head Start Program than the President has requested? How can you do the things the Republicans propose in their resolution and then eliminate the Class Size Reduction Program, making it even more difficult to make sure that every classroom has a qualified teacher. Giving families a \$5 annual tax break isn't going to make schools safer or provide afterschool programs. Vouchers do nothing for these kids left behind in low-performing schools.

I urge our colleagues to look very carefully at this resolution, and look at the statement at the end of the resolution which says this Congress is now in a position to be congratulated for its strong education performance.

How do you congratulate a Congress that cuts as deeply as the House did last week? How do you congratulate a Congress that has nothing to show for the record in education except for an Ed-Flex bill we passed last spring that is of very little value in reaching the goals and the stated objectives in the Republican resolution?

That is why we have offered our resolution. Our resolution addresses the priorities stated by our Republican colleagues. We put our money where our mouth is. We do what we need to do—fund the priorities within this budget to ensure that we are able to achieve those goals, not just talk about them.

We provide \$1.4 billion to reduce class size. We triple the funding for afterschool programs. We increase college access and affordability. We expand opportunities to incorporate education technology. We advance school literacy and readiness.

Those are the kinds of things you need to do if you are serious about these stated goals which are found in both resolutions.

You have to look at what happens once the resolution passes. From where does the money come, and how big a commitment is there on the part of colleagues on either side of the aisle to achieve what we say we want to achieve? Only one resolution pending does that.

I hope everyone will understand that before they cast their vote.

Let me also make a couple of comments. The Senator from Massachusetts did such a good job that very little else needs to be said with regard to some of the remarks made by our Republican colleagues. But the majority leader on Friday made a couple of statements to which I think there must be a response. He pointed out that spending on education has risen every year since the Republicans took the majority.

It has risen, all right. But it has risen over the objections of many of our colleagues on the other side. It has risen only because this caucus and the administration have pressed the Republican leadership and the Republican Members of the Senate to do what we have advocated again this year—to provide the kind of commitment and resources necessary.

One of the Republicans' first action was to rescind \$1.7 billion in education funding. One of their most famous actions over the years has been to propose abolishing the Department of Education altogether. Of course, they shut the Government down in an effort to enact the Draconian cuts in education and all other programs. It was only because Democrats refused to make education such a low priority that these investments are made.

So how ironic now that we have prevailed, they attempt to take credit. I think most people understand that. Democrats have supported real options to involve parents in our education system as well.

Our majority leader asserted last week the Democrats oppose giving parents options. Nothing could be further from the truth. I cannot imagine anybody could actually say that and be serious. We have supported providing choices through open enrollment in public charter schools. More importantly, we believe communities and parents should have the tools—including the resources—to make sure each local neighborhood school provides every single child a high quality education, not just some.

Despite suggestions to the contrary, we support increasing resources for special education. We believe we need to do that in addition to, not instead of, addressing other problems. Helping all children is what we want to do with our educational agenda.

We offered an amendment earlier this year to fully fund the special education program by reducing the Republican tax cut. Guess what. The majority rejected it. I think almost to a person, if not to a person, they rejected it. When it came down to a tax cut or fully funding special education, our Republican colleagues did what we could almost predict they will do every single time: They voted for the tax cut.

I think it is important to note the Republican resolution doesn't give the whole picture about the state of public education. There are problems, but some good things are happening. There is not a word in the resolution they offer today about the good things that have been effective.

I think it was Senator MURRAY who said last week, and it ought to be repeated over and over: Public education isn't failing us; we are failing public education. When we look at the shortfalls in this budget, once again, and the failure to fund the commitment to public education, I think she was right on the mark when she said that.

With the help of incentives from Goals 2000 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, school districts are now setting higher academic standards; many school districts are taking strong steps to reform schools using proven, research-based methodologies. Student performance is rising in math, science, and reading. SAT scores are increasing. Students are taking more rigorous, tougher courses they are doing better. A higher percentage of students are receiving passing grades on advanced placement exams, and fewer students are dropping out. I think it is important to note that the gap between whites and blacks in completing high school is closing in many communities.

I hope our Republican colleagues will join in our agenda to help communities achieve all these goals and more. The bottom line is, they have made education their last—not their first, their

last—priority. As the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, we are less than 1 week away from the end of the fiscal year and we have yet to act on education, yet to act to provide the resources necessary to ensure education is funded.

We have a real opportunity this afternoon to voice our concern, to express our support, to commit the resources. There is no question, a strong public education system is critical for our Nation's future. That is exactly what the Democratic agenda provides.

I urge our colleagues who support the resolution we propose to oppose the Lott-Gregg-Coverdell resolution. I urge my colleagues to make the Federal Government a constructive partner in improving our public schools and to work to enact a strong education agenda with more than rhetoric and with a commitment to the resources and the investments that are required to ensure our actions meet our rhetoric.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. We heard from the majority leader and the Senator from New Hampshire that we don't have to worry about education funding because they are going to have an appropriations bill that will far exceed the President's request.

I ask the Senator if on the one hand he finds it perhaps encouraging that we are finally moving to get education reform, and what kind of consideration we ought to give to that kind of assurance?

It is Monday evening. We go into the fiscal year on Friday. The majority leader has said we are going to have a budget that will exceed the President's. Can the Senator tell me why, if they are going to exceed the President's budget, that suddenly we find this money, does he know of any reason we have not had this money before? Doesn't he believe we should have had it before? Or does he know from where the funding will come?

Mr. DASCHLE. I think the Senator asks a very good question. I respond by asking three questions of my own.

If that is the case, why did the House Republican caucus choose to make the deep cuts they did? And, second, why was there not an outcry on that side of the aisle in this Chamber against those cuts? Where was the outcry when those deep cuts were made? If that is the case, my third question is, why today are we continuing to use the Health and Human Services subcommittee's budget, their allocation, as an ATM machine to fund everything else? Why the outcry on our side? Look at the record. Why the practice of using this budget as an ATM machine for everything else? If they support education, why doesn't the record show it?

I think the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts asks a very good question. Frankly, I am interested in their response to that question.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator will yield further, I searched the RECORD and I didn't find it as of last week when the leader put in his own resolution and when we talked about this. There was no comment, no sense of outrage at that particular time.

This is a poor way of dealing with the families of this country that understand our role in the area of education is limited. We spend about 7 cents out of every dollar, but we try to target it in areas of special need. To be able to on one day see these dramatic cuts and 3 days later hear a statement by the majority leader that it will be far in excess of the President's request, does not he agree with me that the American people are entitled to a more serious discussion and debate of a priority which they believe so deeply is important for their children and the future of this country?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is absolutely right.

Ask people in South Dakota, and I am sure in Massachusetts: What do you want us to put our time, effort, and resources into? Without question, time and time and time again they say: We want to make sure that one thing happens—our young people are educated. We want to make absolutely certain if you do anything, ensure we have an educated workforce.

I was with a number of businesspeople over the weekend. Again, I was reminded this is not just an education issue; this is a business issue, an economic issue. This is an American strength issue. This could be called a national security issue. That is what this is. It isn't just about education. Our country is at stake. Whether or not we educate our young people adequately determines in large measure what kind of economy we will have, what kind of society we have, and certainly what kind of strength we will have in the long term.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I thank the Democratic leader for an excellent statement and for reminding all Members why we are here on a Monday evening debating this issue: The American public has said education is its No. 1 priority. It ought to be the No. 1 priority of the Senate.

I have been delighted to hear the rhetoric from both sides throughout this year that education is the No. 1 priority. That is why I am so disappointed tonight. Clearly, the budget priorities we now see show education has dropped to last. It is the last appropriations bill to be considered. It is the appropriations bill we have been using from which to steal the funds throughout this entire process. Who gets hurt in the end? It is our children.

I listened to a Senator a few minutes ago saying this is a debate about philosophy. I agree. It is a philosophy about whether or not just a few kids in our country get a good education or whether we are going to make sure

every child, no matter who they are or where they come from, gets a good education and how we do that.

In talking to parents across this country, they are not saying eliminate bureaucracy; they are not saying block grant the programs. They are saying: Make sure my child can learn to read and write. They are saying: If my child is in a smaller classroom in first, second, and third grade and gets the attention they need, they will get a good education. They will learn how to read and write; they will be a success.

They are asking Congress to partner with their State and local governments to reduce class size. They are asking Congress to make sure our teachers are given the skills they need to teach the young kids in our classrooms. They are asking Congress to put the resources behind the rhetoric.

When I tell people in my State and across this country that 1.6 percent of the Federal budget goes to education, something they believe is a priority, they are appalled. Education needs to be funded at a level where every child can learn to read and write and be a success in this world. This Congress is failing.

I was extremely disappointed with the House appropriations bill that passed out of committee last week; it eliminated the Eisenhower Teacher Professional Development Program. That is a program that is geared to helping our teachers teach the basics of math and science. Talk to the new startup businesses and the businesses that are succeeding. They say our kids need to learn math and science.

That is what the Eisenhower Grant Program is all about. I met with some scientists in my home State just a few months ago, leaders in the biotech industry, leaders in the technology industry. They spent an evening with me, of their own time, because they wanted to tell me how great the Eisenhower teacher professional development grants were, what they have done for students in our local high schools, invigorated them and got them to go on to science and math in college. They wanted to make sure we continued this program.

What did the House do last week? They took the money out. It is gone. No longer are we saying to schools across this country that making sure we have math and science students who succeed is important. That is wrong.

What else did they do? They eliminated the Goals 2000 Program. This is a program that helps school districts fund their own locally-designed programs to help student achievement by improving the quality of teacher training. Every one of us knows, if you want your company to succeed, you make sure your employees have the best skills they can to work for you. That is what we need to be doing with our teachers. We need to be training them. We need to be making sure they have the skills they need to pass on to our young students today. That is what

Goals 2000 is about. The House eliminated it.

The Class Size Reduction Initiative? Eliminated in the House budget. When I went out to my State just a few weeks ago, I went to a school in Tacoma, WA, where they had taken the Class Size Reduction Initiative money we had given them and focused it entirely on the first grade classrooms in the Tacoma school districts. Today, this year, 57 schools in Tacoma, WA, have 15 students in their first grade classrooms. They then used their title I money to help train those teachers in literacy efforts. Their focus this year is to make sure every first grade student can read at the end of the year. That is an amazing program. We are making it happen with the class size reduction money that was passed with bipartisan support a year ago. We are going to now take that away and tell those students and tell those teachers we no longer are going to help them do what they told me was absolutely critical?

As you can see behind me on this chart, K-12 enrollments are increasing dramatically right now. Why are we, then, reducing the levels of support for these students? We have to make sure every child gets the resources he or she needs. We have to make sure the local communities have the resources behind them. We at the Federal level are a partner with our State and our local governments to make sure our kids learn. We want to know their classes are small enough that kids can learn to read and write and do math. We want to know those teachers are trained. We want to know there are afterschool programs so our students do not go home alone, to their neighborhoods, alone where they are not learning or where they are unproductive or can get in trouble. That is what the Democrats have been fighting for. That is what we will continue to fight for.

We know the rhetoric is not going to educate one child. We know all of the bills with big names are not going to educate one child. We do know the dollars—behind reducing class size, training our teachers, Eisenhower grants—make a difference. School districts are held accountable for making sure our kids learn, and we are making sure we have the resources behind those efforts to make sure it happens.

This debate is important. The debate tonight in the Appropriations Committee is even more important—whether we are willing to put those dollars behind those students. I think it is appalling that our kids have been left to last in the budget process, that they are going to be funded by smoke and mirrors. We will not see the reality of this for probably several months, but it will happen. When this is all said and done, if we do not put the dollars behind our students and our teachers and our schools, our kids will get the message. They will get the message that we do not care. I do not want to be sending that message; I do not think anybody here does.

I have listened to the rhetoric. I have heard every Senator come out and say education is critical. If that is the truth, let's pass the Daschle amendment, go to work and make sure our kids have the resources they need to be productive in the next century.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VOINOVICH addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for an inquiry? I thought the vote was scheduled by unanimous consent to be at 5:30. Might the Senator from New Mexico inquire when we might start voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has been extended. There are a little over 9 minutes for the Senator from Massachusetts and 41 seconds for the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think we were prepared, after these last two speakers, to move ahead. I am told we will reserve.

I know just one Senator who wants to speak for 4 minutes on our side, and we will be prepared to yield back the other time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 41 seconds.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak up to 5 minutes on the pending resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, this morning President Clinton announced we have set a new record budget surplus. It now stands at \$115 billion, according to the President. That would be absolutely wonderful, if it were true. The President says our prosperity now gives us an unprecedented opportunity and an unprecedented responsibility to shape America's future by putting things first, by moving forward with an economic strategy that is successful and sound, and by meeting America's long-term challenges.

He continues to operate as if he has a \$2.9 trillion surplus over the next 10 years to take care of every problem and pay for every program over the next decade. However, the numbers the President is relying on are nothing but a mirage, pure speculation. The \$2.9 trillion surplus everyone seems to be talking about in the next 10 years is based on 10-year projections. As Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said:

... it's very difficult to project with any degree of conviction when you get out beyond 12, 18 months.

In addition, he stated that:

... projecting five or ten years out is a very precarious activity, as I think we have demonstrated time and time again.

Again, the President continues to play games with the numbers and continues to use Social Security to puff up his inflated budget surplus numbers. How much of this \$115 billion so-called surplus is actually offset, using our Na-

tion's pension fund, Social Security? With today's pronouncement, he continues to perpetuate the myth that we have a huge, honest-to-goodness surplus. But he is using Social Security.

Just this last year—and I think this is really important for the American people to understand—there was a great celebration here about having a surplus. But the fact of the matter is that in 1998, when everybody celebrated, there was no on-budget surplus; actually, there was a \$30 billion deficit. That is, the expenses exceeded the revenues, and we glossed it over with the Social Security surplus.

We have to stop playing games as if we had all this money to spend. I think the President is doing the American people a disservice. But it is the only way the President is going to be able to fund his expansion of the Federal Government—by claiming the surplus is bigger than it really is and that we are flush with cash. This is not how we should run the Government. It is just plain wrong.

When I was Governor of Ohio, if somebody had come to me from the schools, or from the cities, and said, "Governor, we want to spend \$100 billion on a program," and then they said to me, "I want to use the pension funds from the State of Ohio to pay for it," I would have thrown them out of the office. That is what we have been doing in this country, and continue to do, is to pay for programs, frankly, that are the responsibilities of State and local government, by taking the money out of Social Security.

If the President was still the Governor of Arkansas, this wonderful program I have heard about from my Democratic colleagues, all this money for schools, and for all these other new programs, would be appropriate. But the President is not the Governor of the United States of America and this Senate is not the school board of America. The responsibility for education is at the State and local level. Today in this country, with our \$5.7 trillion debt, with a deficit that has gone up 1,300 percent, with an interest payment of 14 cents out of every dollar—we are spending more money on interest today than we are on Medicare—we have a terrible financial problem.

I have listened to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the President's vision. I listen to them every day. I watch them on C-SPAN. They are talking about school construction, 100,000 teachers—they are all great priorities, but they are the responsibility of State and local government.

One of the things this Senate has to face up to, and this country has to face up to: There are certain responsibilities on the Federal Government and there are certain responsibilities on State and local government.

I am going to vote against the Democratic leader and his resolution which continues to raid the pension funds of the United States of America. Does everybody hear me? There is no surplus.

Let's stop talking about it. We have a Social Security surplus, and it is time we stop using the pension funds of the people of this country to pay for programs that are the responsibility of State and local government, particularly in terms of where the States are a lot more flush than we are on the Federal level.

Today I will vote against that resolution. I will support the Republican resolution which advocates giving the most amount of flexibility to our State and local school districts and in programs where we do have a proper role.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. VOINOVICH. They are on the front lines and should be given every opportunity to make decisions that are most appropriate for their children.

Earlier this year, we passed Ed-Flex in a bipartisan effort. I even went to the Rose Garden when the President signed it. We need more programs similar to Ed-Flex which give local officials flexibility, and we ought not to be funding State and local programs with our pension funds. I thank the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

I rise to support the Daschle resolution. There is a difference. It says something about any institution in terms of how it prioritizes its agenda, and it says volumes about where the leadership in this Congress is that puts as the last issue for us to discuss and debate the Education appropriations bill. We are last. This is the last one to be considered, despite the fact the American public has said on numerous occasions over the last year or so that they think this is the most important issue. They apparently think it is the least important issue because they have decided to put it at the end of the day. When everything else is taken care of, now we will see if there is anything left over for education.

We have a different point of view. We say we ought to do this first because this is the Nation's No. 1 priority. If we lack an educated society, if we fail to provide opportunities for children and their families to learn, then every other issue will suffer accordingly.

The U.S. Government contributes about 7 percent—7 cents on every dollar—that goes to fund elementary and secondary education. That is our commitment. What we are talking about is as much as a 17-percent cut of that 7 percent. It will be one thing if we are talking about the Federal Government doing the lion's share of the work in education. We are not. We have a paltry 7 percent that we help contribute to the education of America's young people. Now we are talking as much as a 17-percent cut of that 7 percent.

There is a sense of frustration one can hear in our voices because the

American people are frustrated. They understand that for this Nation to succeed in the 21st century, it must have the best prepared, best educated generation we have ever produced. Yet here we are with every other appropriations bill having been passed but this one, the last one.

What does it mean in real terms to the American public? It means in real terms there can be a lot fewer children who will get child care, a lot fewer who will get Head Start—about 140,000 of them—a \$1.3 billion cut in title I, an \$880 million cut in special education.

Let me tell you how important that one is. Ask any mayor of any city in this country whether or not special education dollars are important to them. Put aside, if you will, the needs of families, which I think speak for themselves. But one of the rising costs for our communities across this country is the staggering cost of educating a special needs child. Yet when we are talking about \$880 million in cuts for special education, how do we expect our communities to meet that tremendous challenge for those children?

I respect the Ed-Flex bill. We all voted for it. But to call that major education policy—that does not even come close to being major education policy. It is worthy, but it is not the answer. I think it is things such as class size, school safety, Pell grants for needy families, and certainly doing what we can to see to it there is equal opportunity in education all across this country.

I have school districts in my State where my communities have the resources, and they have every imaginable technological opportunity. But I can take you to a school 15 minutes away in inner cities where you will find four or five computers for a student body of 2,000. I come from an affluent State, but most of our educational funding comes from the local level. There are disparities that exist in every one of our States—huge disparities. When all the U.S. Government does is 7 percent—7 cents on the dollar comes from us—with a huge disparity in opportunity, to suggest somehow we have done enough with the Ed-Flex bill and that is all we need to worry about in 1999 in preparation for the 21st century I do not think convinces the American public we are there.

The Daschle bill is something I will support but, candidly, we ought to be voting on a funding resolution on education, not a sense of the Senate that we ought to deal with education. I am disappointed that is not before us. But of the two propositions in front of us, the Daschle proposal at least lays out the fact we ought to be voting on the funding measures and not stealing from education to pay for every other program in this country. Education ought to come first. That is where we stand, and that is what our resolution suggests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Whatever time is left, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for up to 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBB. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, first, I join my distinguished colleague from Connecticut in his eloquent address and the passion he brings to that subject. I share that passion.

I certainly join many of our colleagues who have spoken about the need to adequately fund our public education system, but I want to respond to an argument the distinguished majority leader made on Friday regarding the condition of our Nation's schools.

The Senator from Mississippi indicated it is not the Federal Government's job to fix leaky roofs. He indicated it is not the responsibility of the Federal Government to build local schools. He indicated that every State has a budget surplus so the Federal Government should not get involved.

As a former Governor who was able to pump over \$1 billion of additional money into public education without a tax increase, I might ordinarily agree with that premise, but there are times which call for extraordinary partnerships among localities, States, and the Federal Government. I believe we are experiencing one of those times.

We have three phenomena that are colliding to put the greatest level of stress on our educational infrastructure that we have seen since the 1950s. Our school facilities across the Nation are over 40 years old on average, our school-age population is skyrocketing, and our States and localities simply do not have the resources to do what needs to be done despite their surpluses.

To say that providing school construction funding is not a Federal responsibility is easy. It is an easy way to sit on our hands and do nothing to help children who wade through puddles to get to class, to do nothing to help children who suffer in up to 100-degree temperatures in buildings with no air conditioning, to do nothing to help the countless mayors across this country who stated they desperately need our help.

In Virginia alone, despite our Commonwealth surplus and plans to invest more money in school infrastructure, we still face a \$4 billion shortfall in school construction and repair needs. I have heard from superintendents, local officials, State legislators, parents, and, most important, students who have all asked for Federal help in this area.

For those colleagues who fear Federal intrusion in the area of education, I simply say, if Federal officials want to help local officials pay for school buildings and repairs, things we all acknowledge we need urgently, how do we encroach on local school control of education? Localities have asked for our help, and it is help we can provide



without telling them how to run their schools. I believe this is actually one of the least intrusive things that we can do to help from the Federal level.

Providing school infrastructure assistance is not intended to be a panacea for all the challenges we face with respect to increasing academic achievement, but it is certainly a critical need.

Under the leadership of a Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, our predecessors in Congress summoned the political will to fund a massive national infrastructure initiative.

We did help build roads. We did help build schools. We did it because our States and localities needed our help. We did it because our population was booming. And we did it to try to ensure that the United States would have the infrastructure it needed to be economically sound and competitive. It is my hope that we can summon that will once again.

With that, Madam President, in full support of the statement made by our distinguished Democratic leader and my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and in opposition to the proposal from the other side of the aisle upon which we will vote momentarily, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

VOTE ON S. RES. NO. 186

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to S. Res. No. 186.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been called for. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to S. Res. 186. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) would vote "no."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 293 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Abraham	Cochran	Fitzgerald
Allard	Collins	Frist
Ashcroft	Coverdell	Gorton
Bennett	Craig	Gramm
Bond	Crapo	Grams
Brownback	DeWine	Grassley
Burns	Domenici	Gregg
Campbell	Enzi	Hatch

Helms	McConnell	Smith (OR)
Hutchinson	Murkowski	Snowe
Hutchinson	Nickles	Specter
Inhofe	Roberts	Stevens
Jeffords	Roth	Thomas
Kyl	Santorum	Thompson
Lott	Sessions	Thurmond
Lugar	Shelby	Voinovich
Mack	Smith (NH)	Warner

NAYS—42

Akaka	Durbin	Levin
Baucus	Edwards	Lieberman
Bayh	Feingold	Lincoln
Biden	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnson	Robb
Cleland	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerry	Schumer
Dodd	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Bunning	Kohl	Torricelli
Chafee	Leahy	
Hagel	McCain	

The resolution (S. Res. 186) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 186

Whereas the fiscal year 2000 Senate Budget Resolution increased education funding by \$28,000,000,000 over the next five years, and \$82,000,000,000 over the next ten years, and the Department of Education received a net increase of \$2,400,000,000 which doubles the President's requested increase;

Whereas compared to the President's requested levels, the Democratically controlled Congress' appropriations for the period 1993 through 1995 reduced the President's funding requests by \$3,000,000,000, and since Republicans took control of Congress, Federal education funding has increased by 27 percent;

Whereas in the past three years, the Congress has increased funding for Part B of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act by nearly 80 percent, while the Administration's fiscal year 2000 budget only requested a 0.07 percent increase which is less than an adjustment for inflation, and Congress is deeply concerned that while the Administration has provided rhetoric in support of education of the disabled, the Administration's budget has consistently taken money from this high priority program to fund new and untested programs;

Whereas Congress is not only providing the necessary funds, but is also reforming our current education programs, and Congress recognizes that significant reforms are needed in light of troubling statistics indicating—

(1) 40 percent of fourth graders cannot read at the most basic level;

(2) in international comparisons, United States 12th graders scored near the bottom in both mathematics and science;

(3) 70 percent of children in high poverty schools score below even the most basic level of reading; and

(4) in mathematics, 9 year olds in high poverty schools remain two grade levels behind students in low poverty schools;

Whereas earlier in 1999, the 106th Congress took the first step toward improving our Nation's schools by passing the Education Flexibility and Partnership Act of 1999, which frees States and local communities to tailor education programs to meet the individual needs of students and local schools;

Whereas the 1999 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of

1965 will focus on increasing student achievement by empowering principals, local school boards, teachers and parents, and the focus should be on raising the achievement of all students;

Whereas Congress should reject a one-size-fits all approach to education, and local schools should have the freedom to prioritize their spending and tailor their curriculum according to the unique educational needs of their children;

Whereas parents are the first and best educators of their children, and Congress supports proposals that provide parents greater control to choose unique educational opportunities to best meet their children's educational needs;

Whereas every child should have an exceptional teacher in the classroom, and Congress supports efforts to recruit, retrain, and retain high quality teachers;

Whereas quality instruction and learning can occur only in a first class school that is safe and orderly;

Whereas Congress supports proposals that give schools the support they need to protect teachers and students, remove disruptive influences, and create a positive learning atmosphere; and

Whereas success in education is best achieved when instruction focuses on basic academics and fundamental skills, and students should no longer be subjected to untried and untested educational theories of instruction, rather our Nation's efforts should be geared to proven methods of instruction: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) this Congress has taken strong steps to reform our Nation's educational system and allowed States, local schools and parents more flexibility and authority over their children's education; and

(2) the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will enable this Congress to continue its efforts to send decision making back to States, local schools, and families.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON S. RES. 187

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to S. Res. 187. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) would vote "aye."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 294 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Akaka	Edwards	Lieberman
Baucus	Feingold	Lincoln
Bayh	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Breaux	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Johnson	Robb
Cleland	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kerry	Schumer
Dodd	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wyden
Durbin	Levin	

NAYS—52

Abraham	Frist	Nickles
Allard	Gorton	Roberts
Ashcroft	Gramm	Roth
Bennett	Grams	Santorum
Bond	Grassley	Sessions
Brownback	Gregg	Shelby
Burns	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Byrd	Helms	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Snowe
Cochran	Hutchison	Specter
Collins	Inhofe	Stevens
Coverdell	Jeffords	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Lott	Thurmond
DeWine	Lugar	Voinovich
Domenici	Mack	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	
Fitzgerald	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—7

Bunning	Kohl	Torricelli
Chafee	Leahy	
Hagel	McCain	

The resolution (S. Res. 187) was rejected.

Mr. LOTT. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what is the pending business if we were to go to the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 625.

Mr. KENNEDY. The bankruptcy legislation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business would have been S. 625, which is the bankruptcy bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Further reserving the right to object, if that legislation were before the Senate, would it be in order for me to offer the minimum wage as an amendment—if it were pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments are in order, if it were pending.

Mr. KENNEDY. But, as I understand it, the leader now has indicated, by consent request, that we go to morning business, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Further reserving the right to object, can the leader give us any idea when we will be back on the pending legislation, the bankruptcy legislation? Or when we will have an opportunity to address the issue of the minimum wage?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. LOTT. I would like to get to the bankruptcy reform legislation. I think that is important. We need to have this reform. The system is not working well now, and there is broad support, I think on both sides of the aisle, for bankruptcy reform. I think we could move to the bill if we could have a full debate on bankruptcy and relevant amendments to that. We could probably even work out an agreement that would include consideration of the small businessman's and small businesswoman's needs, and minimum wage needs. But I do not think it is fair the bankruptcy reform legislation, which should be considered in and of and by itself, should become an out-basket for every amendment to be offered on every subject that has already, in many instances, been considered this year, and that it become a Christmas tree for all kinds of unrelated amendments.

That is why I moved to a cloture vote because I wanted to get up bankruptcy reform. I would like to go to that. I will be glad to work out some sort of agreement as to how that bill will be considered. But I do not think we have the time right now, with the appropriations bills we have to complete before the end of the fiscal year. Hopefully, the last one, the 13th one, will be up—it will be up on Wednesday. We will be on that bill until we complete it. Hopefully, we will complete it by midnight on Thursday night, which would be the 13th bill. It would be only about the third time in the last 15 or 20 years we will have passed all appropriations bills through the Senate by the end of the fiscal year.

So that has been our focus. We have been focusing on the appropriations bills. We will have a conference report in the morning we will need to vote on, the Energy and Water appropriations bill. We will continue to move those bills and the conference reports through. When we get through with that process, then we will look back to what the legislative schedule is going to be. I hope we can come to agreement on how that would be considered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Just further reserving the right to object, of course, we did not give a clear indication whether we would have the opportunity to vote on an increase in the minimum wage. We have seen Members vote for an increase in their own pay, their salaries, for some \$4,400. We have doubled the President's salary. We voted for an increase for the military, which I strongly support, and also for Government employees.

I wonder when we will be able to enter into some kind of agreement on

the minimum wage. I do not think it will take a great deal of time. We will be glad to do it of an evening, if it would be more convenient for the leadership, working out the schedule. But we have not had the opportunity for the Senate to express its will. We would like to at least get some indication from the leader as to when we might be able to do this, since the days are moving along and still many workers, who are working 40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year, have not participated in the very substantial economic progress and are looking to the Senate to see whether we will address this issue.

Can the leader help us at all, in terms of indicating when we might have some chance to address that?

Mr. LOTT. I can't at this time because we must focus on the appropriations bills through the remainder of this week. I will need to discuss this with Senator DASCHLE and Senator KENNEDY and see if we can come up with a way we can handle that issue without it opening up the door to all kinds of other issues that, in many instances, for instance, we may have already considered in the Senate.

Having said that, whatever we do, I want to make sure we do it in such a way that entry-level workers, people who do come into restaurants and other small businesses, don't wind up losing their jobs. That is important to them. Also, that we do not wind up doing it in such a way that small businessmen and small businesswomen cannot continue to stay in business.

So I think we have to find a way to offset the costs, particularly for small businessmen and small businesswomen who are working on a very small margin of profit. I know I have heard from some. I remember one lady in particular, outside of Atlanta—I think maybe in Marietta—who had a sweet shop. She basically said: If you do this again without some sort of offsets, I cannot make up the difference anymore myself.

So we have to make sure it is a balanced approach when we do consider this and however we consider it.

However, the answer to your question is any time you and Senator DASCHLE want to sit down and seriously discuss a way to get this done, I will be ready to do it, once we get through the appropriations process, which will be done, hopefully, at the end of this week.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have no objection.

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

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