

would suspend these sanctions, the economic sanctions, toward India and Pakistan.

I think it is high time that the United States aggressively build its relationship with India and aggressively build its relationship with Pakistan. We need to do this. We need to have a broad-based relationship and not one that just has very narrow sanctions associated with it. For instance, as well, the administration is pushing that to lift these sanctions on India, they are telling the Indian Government, basically, they have to agree to CTBT, the Conventional Test Ban Treaty, in spite of the fact that the Senate may never pick this up. They are saying unless they agree to this, we are not going to lift these sanctions. It is a very narrow discussion point that they have with India, instead of having this broad-based discussion about how can we expand trade relationships, expand diplomatic relationships, and work together on issues of key concern.

We should be asking: How can we expand relationships in the broad set of fields that we have? Instead, it is they have to agree to the CTBT, or we are not going to lift these economic sanctions on them, period. That is too narrow of a relationship for us to build with a great nation. India will be the largest nation in the world in the next 10 years, population-wise. It has an extraordinarily large middle class. It has a number of people in a very poor situation, as well, but it has a large middle class.

Look also at Pakistan. It is in the amendment where we suspend economic sanctions for 5 years and have a waiver on others. Pakistan sits in a difficult spot, right next to Afghanistan. They have had a lot of problems with Afghanistan. Pakistan seeks to be a friend of the United States. It is partly, obviously, an Islamic country and has been a key ally of ours in defeating the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. After Afghanistan, the Soviets backed off and we pulled out altogether. We not only sanctioned them under the Glenn amendment, we also had the Pressler amendment that basically removed our relationship with Pakistan, an Islamic country that seeks to be our friend, and we just nail them.

It makes no sense to me why we do these sorts of things, and why the President, the Clinton administration, seeks to sanction a country that seeks to work with us, and closely with us, while with China we have had all this theft of technology, shipment of weapons of mass destruction, all the human rights abuses, and we are willing to look the other way.

I think we ought to have trade relationships with China. I think it is important that we have a broad-based relationship with China. But at the same time we need to be expanding our relationships with India and Pakistan. These are countries—particularly in India's case—that share a lot of our traditions. I think it is wrong for us to

have a double standard, particularly against a country that should be a very valuable future partner.

I chair the Foreign Relations subcommittee that deals with both India and Pakistan, and it has been beyond me to understand the difference in U.S. policy toward these giant Asian countries. I think it is wrong of the administration to have this different policy. I think we really need to be much more aggressive and engaged and be a vibrant, broad-based partner with India. I think it can be a good future relationship. It is something we can use as an offset toward China, in some respects, and our large dependency on China. I think it can be a future growth market for States such as mine and many others that have agricultural and aircraft products that we export. I think it can be a growing, vibrant market for us, one that shares a lot of our relationships and views and needs.

I wanted to bring to the attention of my colleagues what is really happening in foreign policy. We also had a hearing yesterday on the issue of Iraq. I wanted to mention this tangentially because I think it is appropriate. We had people testifying from the Iraqi National Congress—a representative of the INC, Mr. Chalabi—and we had other witnesses testifying that Saddam Hussein is probably at his weakest point since the United States was engaged with Iraq. They are having daily reports of insurrection in the southern part of Iraq, and the northern part of the country is no longer in the control of Saddam Hussein.

There are other factions that are controlling much of this Kurdish region. Yet the United States, in the Iraq liberation, provided \$97 million of drawdown authority and support for the opposition movement, and all we are giving the opposition movement is file cabinets and fax machines. Why aren't we really supporting this opposition movement that seeks to meet inside Iraq to set up more of a civil society in the region that Saddam doesn't control? Why aren't we really supporting these guys?

I asked the administration witness yesterday—Under Secretary Beth Jones, a bright and good person—Do you think Saddam Hussein is going to outlast another U.S. President? Is he going to outlast President Clinton?

She says: I really don't know.

I said we know how to aggressively push and prosecute these issues in Kosovo. Why is it that we can't do this in Iraq? Why can't we support the opposition groups and give them lethal and nonlethal assistance that we can find truly necessary? Why can't we help them have a meeting of the Iraqi National Congress inside Iraq where they want to meet? It would send a powerful statement across the world that the INC, a potential opposition government, is meeting within Iraq.

Yet the administration is not willing to step forward and is saying they are not so sure about whether or not we

should do this. We are willing to give the opposition file cabinets and fax machines, but we won't give them training and lethal technology or the ability to fight. This is an extraordinary situation. It is one on which the Congress needs to speak out more.

We need to aggressively move forward now on Saddam Hussein. We need to do that by supporting the opposition. This isn't about sending in U.S. troops. This is about supporting an opposition that wants to fight with Saddam Hussein, that wants to put the parts together to have a democratic Iraq, that wants to be an ally—not just that but wants the Iraqi people to be proud of and pleased with their government, instead of constantly harassed and killed by their leadership.

Why on earth are we not pushing this and stepping forward and being more aggressive? I fail to get adequate answers from the Clinton administration on why. We know how to push forward aggressively on Kosovo. Why can't we deal in such a manner with Iraq? We know how to build a relationship with China. Why can't we build relationships with India and Pakistan? I really don't understand what is taking place. I ask these questions, and we are going to continue to hold hearings on these issues. We need to move forward in building a better relationship with India and Pakistan and dealing with the situation in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have 18 minutes on the Republican side and 30 minutes remaining on the Democrat side. Ten minutes have been reserved for the Senator from Minnesota.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am not going to take my time at this moment. Senator KERREY will precede me.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Alexis Rebane and Sofia Lidshog, two interns, be allowed floor privileges for the debate today.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CLELAND be allowed to be in order as the Democrat to speak after I speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

READING SCORES

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I am here to take a couple of minutes to

point out a success story that appeared in the Lincoln Journal Star.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lincoln Journal Star, June 23, 1999]

READING SCORES RISE AGAIN

(By Joanne Young)

Right before his eyes, Steven Hladik saw his daughter's life change.

"She's just happy. She went from being a sad little girl to totally loving life," Hladik said of his third youngest child, Nikyle, 6.

He attributes the change to Reading Recovery, one program Lincoln Public Schools has used to improve first-graders' reading skills. A dramatic decline over 15 years in reading scores of elementary- and middle-school students prompted LPS to focus on bringing those scores up.

Metropolitan Achievement Test reading scores are up for the second straight year for grades 2-8, according to a report to the Lincoln Board of Education. This snapshot of 1999 achievement showed that since 1997, second-graders have improved 16 percent. Third-graders are up 12 percent, fourth- and fifth-graders up 8 percent. Only ninth-grade scores have held about the same.

Math scores, which had declined along with reading scores, are up in all grades, with six of eight grades working at 70 percent or better of their peers nationwide.

LPS Associate Superintendent Marilyn Moore delivered the good news Tuesday at a school board meeting.

Board member Shirley Doan said the improvements came because of commitment by teachers, principals and students.

"I think we have giants standing on the shoulders of giants here," Doan said. "Can we do it again? It would be very unusual, but I think we can."

About the same number of students were tested in 1998 and 1999. More special education and English as a Second Language students were given accommodations this year, such as more test time and help with instructions. But a second analysis of '98 and '99 scores that excluded all special education and ESL students verified that scores improved, Moore said.

Leslie Lukin, LPS assessment specialist, pointed to several reasons for the reading improvement: Teachers have changed the way they teach reading in kindergarten through third grade, with different teaching plans for each grade. They also are familiarizing students with the format and type of questions on the achievement tests.

But Reading Recovery may have produced the most dramatic results.

Aimed at the 20 percent of first graders having the hardest time learning to read, the program offers one-on-one help with letters, sounds, sentence structure and reading methods. Kids spend half an hour a day with Reading Recovery teachers and special books. Then they read at home with parents.

Jeanette Tiwarld, the LPS Reading Recovery teacher leader said Reading Recovery builds on children's strengths—what they already know—to accelerate their learning and improve their confidence.

The number of children in the program have gone up as more teachers have taken the rigorous Reading Recovery training and more schools have added the curriculum. In the 1994 school year, 78 children passed through the full program. Last year, the number jumped to 527.

Questionnaires from parents of this year's Reading Recovery students sang the praises

of the program. Their children were much more confident, they said, far happier after catching up with their schoolmates in reading.

For Nikyle, it was a godsend.

She had changed schools three times in kindergarten, just as she was starting to learn, because her mom and dad were splitting up, her dad said. She started first grade at McPhee Elementary and then when her father got custody of her and three brothers and sisters, she moved to Calvert Elementary.

All the while, because of everything going on in his own life, Steven, Hladik didn't realize the effect on Nikyle. She was being in learning, and she was miserable.

"She hated to go to school. It was hard to get her up and make her go," her father said. "She was insecure and really quite."

Now she loves school. And her confidence has soared.

Not only has her reading improved so have her math and other subjects, her friendships, her self-esteem.

She's making sure what happened to her doesn't happen to her 4-year-old sister, Stephanie.

"Every night she sits and reads books to her," her father said.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, this is about the success of a Federally funded program that was implemented by heroic people in Lincoln, NE—they include principals, schoolteachers, and the Lincoln school board. I am talking about Title I. One of the reasons I talk about it a great deal is that, in Nebraska, there are 17,000 students that are eligible for Title I, but because we don't appropriate enough money, they are not funded. They don't get the benefits of this kind of effort.

What this article talks about is a program called Reading Recovery that has been implemented in the Lincoln public school system over the last 3 years—and it's a very rigorous program. The teachers had to train themselves; they had to make a commitment to acquire the skills necessary to implement this program. The article starts off with a parent talking about the exhilaration of seeing his daughter learn how to read and make progress—be successful, in other words. What they have done is quite remarkable. It needs to be observed because citizens need to know that success indeed is possible.

Second graders have improved their reading scores 16 percent; third graders, 12 percent; fourth and fifth graders are up 8 percent. These are dramatic increases. They have achieved the increases by starting at a very early age, using Title I moneys, using this Reading Recovery program, and going after young people who are at risk, who are falling behind, who have come into the school system without these reading skills.

They have said if you want to lift the overall test scores, quite correctly, you have to help those who are most likely to fail if we don't intervene. That is what Title I is. It is not the Federal Government telling these local schools what to do. We recently passed an Ed-Flex bill that provided increased flexibility. I support that. But unless we

provide resources, it is impossible for local heroes to take the money and make something of it.

I will point out, in addition to the necessity of an early effort, an additional challenge we face. It's explained in one little paragraph here. Those of us born in 1943 sort of remember schools in the 1950s and 1960s and think, gee, why can't we do it the way we did it? Things have changed. In this article, one little paragraph says the following about this young girl who was given the benefit of this program:

She had changed schools three times in kindergarten, just as she was starting to learn, because her mom and dad were splitting up, her dad said.

She ended up caught in the middle of a custody battle, a transfer occurred, and as a consequence of the transfer, she fell behind. That is what happened. What Title I enabled her to do was catch up. It is quite a miraculous thing that happened as a consequence, as I said, of significant local commitment and the help of teachers who trained themselves and a principal who was committed. One of the principals is Deann Currin at Elliott Elementary. The Lincoln school board supported Reading Recovery. They used title I money. Again, it is not the Federal Government telling them what to do, but providing them the resources.

I regret to say that in Nebraska, there are 17,000 children eligible for Title I programs that simply are not able to benefit because we are not providing a sufficient amount of resources.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

CHILDREN AND EDUCATION

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, first of all, I thank Senator KERREY for talking about children and education. It is truly a good news/bad news story. The good news is we have heroes and heroines right in our own communities that, with these resources, can really give children a chance to develop their full potential. If there is anything we should do as a Senate, it is to make sure each child has that chance. The bad news is, I say to my colleague, in Minnesota so many students could be helped, but we don't have the resources. There are schools in Minnesota with up to a 65-student population that don't receive a cent because by the time it is allocated in the cities, the schools aren't eligible, and those kids don't receive the help. It is just as big an issue in rural areas.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, this is not a situation where we don't know what to do. This is a situation where there is an answer and we simply are not doing it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is correct. This is really just harping on the complexity of it all is the ultimate simplification. We know what to do, and it