

name only. Sixty percent of the measure on which we are going to vote today is for matters that have nothing to do with the marriage penalty. Sixty percent of the \$248 billion proposal goes to people who do not face a marriage penalty.

The majority likes to talk about relevance. I know a little bit about relevance, as I think most people do. Sixty percent of this bill is irrelevant to the marriage penalty.

The majority is seeking to cut off debate on this bill before it is even begun. Invoking cloture would also block Democratic amendments that propose better ways to eliminate the marriage penalty and to address other urgent priorities such as prescription drug benefits for seniors.

Democratic amendments say, yes, let's fix the marriage penalty for people who actually pay it. In fact, one of the amendments proposed by Senators MOYNIHAN and BAUCUS, the lead Democrats in the Finance Committee, says: There are 65 marriage penalty provisions in the Tax Code with one sentence; let's eliminate all of them. That is one of the things we are being prevented from bringing forward.

We want to move forward and start legislating the way this Senate has debated for over 200 years. We have agreed to say, OK, we are not going to go along with what the Senate has done for 200 years. We will play the game of the majority in an effort to allow our voices to be heard just a little bit.

Even though the Standing Rules of the Senate don't require it, we have bent over backwards to keep our amendments short. We have 10 amendments, and we have agreed to limit debate on those amendments to 1 hour each.

These are amendments by Senators MOYNIHAN and BAUCUS on the tax proposal. Senator BAYH, one of the most thoughtful Senators we have ever had in the Senate, has talked about another alternative.

We have amendments offered by Senator SCHUMER from New York dealing with the college tuition tax credit. We have one amendment by Senator DORGAN who represents the farm community. He wants to do something about CRP in the tax bill. These are amendments that should take several hours if they were debated properly. We are willing to take a half an hour and have the majority have a half an hour. That seems fair, but we have been prevented from doing that.

We could finish this bill in 1 day. The question is, Why will Republicans not stop casting blame and get on with the marriage tax penalty vote? Sadly, the answer is somewhere blowing in the wind. Republicans know Democrats have better proposals. Republicans also know that given a choice, the American people prefer the minority's approach. The American people say give us marriage tax penalty relief and a few other things such as prescription

drug benefits for senior citizens, who simply are desperate for some relief. The average senior citizen gets 18 drug prescriptions filled a year with no benefit at all from Medicare, and we need to get that benefit to them. That is what we are trying to do.

The majority, once again, is afraid, despite having the majority. They have a 10-Member majority in the Senate and they are afraid to cast votes on our amendments. That goes to other issues, too, not only marriage tax penalty. The majority never tire of using procedural maneuvers to block or delay on the issues the American people care about most.

The majority today is out of step with the American people on issue after issue, so this majority spends most of its energy plotting ways to disguise its own extreme agenda, scurrying to avoid responsibility for its continuing failure to take up the problems the voters sent us to address. That is why the majority constantly resorts to procedural devices such as cloture, or another favorite, the conference committee "deep freeze," like they have done on the conference report on bankruptcy. We have been prevented from going forward with the Export Administration Act, which the high-tech community is very desirous of moving forward. Why? Because certain members of the majority think we are still in the cold war and we cannot go forward with bringing high-tech industry into the modern world. That also takes into consideration our inability to go forward on the Juvenile Justice Act, which deals with gun safety for children, Patients' Bill of Rights, and a number of other things.

The majority leader said on February 3:

We're out of town 2 months and our approval rating went up 11 points. I think I've got this thing figured out.

He is right. Whenever the majority, the Republicans who control Congress, are out of the public eye they seem to be better off. It is when the public sees how out of step they are that they get into trouble. That is what is going on. No one should be deceived. We are ready to go to work right now. We are simply waiting for the majority to stop their foot-dragging and blame games, stop hiding their faulty legislation behind procedural votes and get serious.

When the majority works up the courage to have a real debate on these issues, to stand up and be counted on their ideas versus our ideas, we hope they will let us know. Until then, Republicans can file cloture as often as they like. It is a cynical and not very clever blame game. The Democrats are sick and tired of playing it, but we will continue to fight.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I would like to make the following announcement. Today, the Senate will be in a period of morn-

ing business until 12 noon. At noon, the Senate will proceed with a cloture vote on the pending amendment to the marriage tax penalty bill. As a reminder, second-degree amendments to the substitute amendment must be filed at the desk by 11 a.m. today. If cloture is invoked, the Senate will begin debate on the bill. If cloture is not invoked, the Senate will resume debate on the motion to proceed to the victims' rights constitutional amendment in anticipation of proceeding to that resolution today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the time that had been allotted to the leader, or his designee, be extended to 10:15 today.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES ACT

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, next week we begin the debate on the Education Opportunities Act. I had the opportunity yesterday to come to the Senate floor and talk about one aspect of that bill. That had to do with the whole issue of supporting our teachers, attracting the best teachers to education. Today I would like to talk about a second component of that bill having to do with safer schools. Good teachers, safe schools: It is really getting back to basics.

We have a drug crisis in this country. Drugs are readily available and, tragically, children are using them. In fact, more children today are using and experimenting with drugs than 10 years ago—many, many more. Let's look at the facts.

According to the 1999 Monitoring the Future study, since 1992, overall drug use among 10th graders has increased 55 percent. Marijuana and hashish use among 10th graders has increased 91 percent. Heroin use among 10th graders has increased 92 percent. That is just since 1992. And cocaine use among 10th graders has increased 133 percent.

With an abundant supply, drug traffickers are looking to increase their sales by targeting younger and younger children, creating a whole new generation of addicts. Drug dealers are now targeting children not only in our urban areas but in every community in our land.

The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University issued a disturbing report earlier this year. It had to do with the rapidly rising rate of drug use among youth in the rural areas of our country. The figures are astounding. If anyone thinks it cannot happen in your community—"it can't happen in my community"—take a look at these figures.

Their study found that eighth graders in rural America are 34 percent

more likely to smoke marijuana than those in urban areas; 50 percent more likely to use powder cocaine; and 83 percent more likely to use crack cocaine.

These statistics represent an assault on our children, on our families, and on the future of our country. Let me point out what is happening on the streets of Cincinnati in my home State. In 1990, there were 19 heroin-related arrests in Cincinnati, OH. Last year there were 464 arrests. Law enforcement officers in Cincinnati understand the reason for this surge. Colombia produces low-cost, high-purity heroin, making it more and more the drug of choice. And because of our Government's inadequate emphasis on drug interdiction and eradication efforts, that Colombian heroin is making its way across our borders, into our country, and into Cincinnati, OH, and Cleveland, OH, and Detroit and Los Angeles.

Sure, this is just one urban area we are talking about, Cincinnati, but if there is a heroin problem in Cincinnati, there is a heroin problem in New York and LA and every metropolitan area across our great country.

I believe what is happening in Cincinnati and across all parts of America is a result of a national drug control approach that has not emphasized the importance of a balanced attack against drug use. To be effective, our drug control strategy needs to be a coordinated effort that directs and balances resources and support among three areas of attack: domestic law enforcement, international drug interdiction, and demand reduction.

When we talk about demand reduction, we are talking about several things. Demand reduction needs to consist of drug prevention, drug treatment, and drug education. We need to involve all levels of government in this three-pronged attack—the Federal, State, and local—as well as nonprofit private organizations, charitable groups, community groups.

What all this means is that to effectively stop our kids from getting and using illicit drugs we must balance the allocation of resources towards efforts to stop those who produce drugs, those who transport illegal drugs, and those who deal drugs on our streets, and, yes, even in our schools.

Because the threat of violence and drug abuse in our schools is all too real, we must get to our kids before the drug dealers do. We can do this. We can give America's kids a fighting chance through coordinated efforts between our schools and our communities. Next week, when the Senate begins debating the education reform legislation that I referenced a moment ago, we will have a great opportunity to enhance a very important program designed to educate our kids and our communities about the dangers of drug use.

This bill includes a section that I helped write to make much needed improvements, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program.

This program, which was originally part of Ronald Reagan's 1986 Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, is intended to assist every single school district in the country to develop an anti-drug program in their respective schools. While well intentioned, this program has been far from perfect.

I had the opportunity a few years ago when I served in the House of Representatives to be on the National Commission for Safe and Drug-Free Schools. We looked at how this program had worked. We found many problems connected with it. The bill we have written and will be on the floor next week I believe will go a long way to solving the problems that the national commission pointed out in 1990 and that we have seen since then. These problems need to be corrected, and I believe this bill will go a long way to do that.

Since the inception of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program in 1986, we have pumped \$6 billion into this program, despite the fact the program has lacked accountability, giving us no real mechanism to determine its effectiveness. Instead, we have seen some of our tax dollars pay for questionable drug use "prevention" and "education" activities, such as puppet shows, tickets to Disneyland, dunking booths, and magic shows. No matter how well intentioned, these are not effective antidrug education tools. Because there has been little effort to ensure program accountability through research-based measures, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program has not been as effective as it could have been, or as it should be.

It is critical the Senate pass education reform legislation that includes improvements to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program, improvements that will empower America's families and America's teachers with the information, with the training, with the resources they need to help our children resist the temptation of drugs. That is why our section in this bill would, first and most importantly, increase accountability measures to ensure that assistance is targeted to effective research-based programs. That means programs that actually work and have been tested and measured and we know work. My language will make sure schools and communities assess local problems accurately, apply research-based solutions, measure outcomes with reliable tools, and evaluate program effectiveness.

Second, my language would improve the effectiveness of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program by requiring schools to directly work with parents, with local law enforcement agencies, local government agencies, local faith-based organizations, and other community groups to develop and implement antidrug and antiviolenence strategies.

As we all know, drug abuse and violence among young people is a community problem, it is a local problem, and

it requires a local community-based solution. That is why the entire community needs to be involved in the creation and execution of programs to fight youth drug abuse and violence. Our bill requires the schools to reach out to the local community, to work with other people who are fighting drugs, to have a true community-based approach.

Speaking of fighting youth drug abuse and violence, no one is fighting harder than the first lady of the State of Ohio, Hope Taft. Hope has been very instrumental in the creation of this section of our bill. I publicly thank her for her great work. She was really instrumental in creating a voice for community-based antidrug organizations. Hope Taft's efforts have raised awareness of the dangers of youth drug abuse and violence in our schools.

Also, I am pleased several community groups have indicated their support for our provision in title IV of the bill we will be debating next week. I will name a few: The American Counseling Association, the American School Health Association, the Community Antidrug Coalition of America, the National Network for Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities, and Ohio Parents for Drug Free Youth. These are just a few of the organizations that have helped us craft this bill.

Third and finally, our language in title IV would give States greater flexibility on targeting assistance to the schools particularly in need. Each State has unique drug prevention challenges, and this bill provides the States with flexibility to target funds to all of their schools but focus on those schools with the greatest drug violence problems. This flexibility is very significant and very important.

Contrast the administration's proposal with our proposal: They want each State to cut by half the number of school districts that benefit from the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Communities Act. Let me make it clear; under the administration's proposal which they sent up to Capitol Hill, half the school districts in the country would lose their funding. I think that is a mistake. Reinvesting in an improved Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program is a critical part of restoring effectiveness and purpose to our national drug policy.

Ultimately, if we do not restore effectiveness, more and more children will use drugs, leading to greater levels of violence, criminal activity, and delinquency. Unless we take action now, unless we take the necessary steps to reverse these disturbing trends, unless we restore balance to our drug control policy, we will be sacrificing today's youth and our country's future, and that is just plain wrong.

Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague, Senator GORTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for the remainder of the leader's time.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, next week when the Senate takes up the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it will be dealing with the most important single issue, with the most vital single goal with which it will deal during the course of this session of Congress. That debate will be about our children, about their education, and about their future.

There is unanimous recognition in this body that a good education, an education for the 21st century, will help our children and our grandchildren have an economically independent future, to understand the history of their tradition and their culture, and will open to all of their lives an opportunity for lifetime learning and personal enrichment.

At the same time, as citizens, we recognize that the future of our democracy depends upon an educated citizenry and that we will need more and better educated people in an ever more complicated future.

This year alone, I have had an opportunity, both in person and through video conferencing, to visit dozens of schools in individual school districts in my own State, an experience I know many of my colleagues have shared. More than a year ago, we developed a system of recognizing on almost a weekly basis an outstanding educator or an outstanding program someplace in the State of Washington, to both recognize and reward the innovation, the new thinking we all approve but sometimes find difficult to discover.

Educators in my State—teachers, principals, superintendents, school board members—and thoughtful and involved parents are proud of their successes, but that pride is mixed with frustration, a frustration from the limitations placed on their ability to do what they think best for schoolchildren under their care because of the massive rules and regulations emanating from Washington, DC. Massive, I say, out of all proportion to the amount of money that comes to facilitate that education from sources in the District of Columbia.

With all the good will in the world, we now, for 35 years, have attempted to reduce the gap between underprivileged and normally privileged children through title I. The Federal Government has spent more than \$100 billion to reach that goal. But, bluntly, the goal has not only not been reached, it has not even been approached.

We find in the country as a whole that two out of every three African American and Hispanic fourth graders can barely read. We find that 70 percent of children in high-poverty schools score below the most basic reading level. We find that fourth graders in high-poverty schools remain two or three grade levels behind their peers in low-poverty schools.

For these kids, and for the future of our country, we can do better. We must do better. How can we possibly argue that maintaining the present system,

or by adding to its complexity by increasing the number of rules and regulations coming from Washington, DC, we can help these disadvantaged students in the light of this history, or help any of our other students, for that matter?

The status quo in the future will mean what the status quo in the past has meant. I am convinced—I hope all of us are convinced—that no child should be left behind.

For the last 3 years, I have worked on, spoken for, and proposed to this body, new and better approaches that are now a part of the bill we will be dealing with next week called Straight A's, to allow innovation in States and in local communities in school districts across the United States, and to serve those children who are left behind by the present system.

Straight A's would change the present pattern—unfortunately, in the form in which this bill appears before us in only 15 States; but in 15 very fortunate States—by giving them far more flexibility to use the money that comes from the Federal Government in the best interests of their children, without the blizzard of forms and paperwork that plagues our schools at the present time but with one overwhelmingly important underlined requirement: that the academic achievement of our children demonstrably improve on the basis of objective tests imposed by each of the States that take advantage of Straight A's.

Under Straight A's, States and local communities could target more dollars to high-poverty areas if they believe that is an effective use of the money. In a very real sense, they would be encouraged to do so or to change the system for the better because, for the first time, States and local school districts would be rewarded—tangibly rewarded—by receiving an increased appropriation if, and as, they reduce the gap between disadvantaged students and other students in their systems.

Right now there is no such incentive, simply hundreds of different categorical aid programs, many of them highly duplicative in nature, creating all kinds of bureaucracies that have succeeded in either getting dollars through to the classroom or in the far more important goal of raising student achievement.

Yesterday, at a news conference, the State superintendent of schools in Georgia said 50 percent of the money that her schools received from the Federal Government went to administrative costs—50 percent—a terrible indictment of the present system. That money should be found in our schools educating our children, not creating more paperwork and more forms.

The most dynamic forces in our schools today, in our education system today, are found in our States and in our local communities, not here in Washington, DC. Parents want a better education, and, Lord knows, those men and women who dedicate their entire

lives to teaching our children—teachers and principals and superintendents—wish for exactly the same thing.

I am convinced that we can enable them, we can empower them, to provide a far more effective education system for all of our children than we are doing at the present time.

The way that we will provide that power, the way we will enable them, will be to trust them to make the right decisions, but in an expression borrowed from the cold war: Trust but verify. And we will verify. The only valid method of verification: A set of tests under which their actual objective achievement will be measured and reported here to Washington, DC, and to this Congress.

This should not be—and I hope will not be—a partisan issue. I am convinced that working together we can significantly improve our system of public education in the United States and significantly increase the participation—the constructive participation—that this body, the Congress, and the President, make to that. I hope next week will be the advent of debate that will have exactly those results.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, every young person in our country should have the opportunity to grow and learn in an environment that is free of drugs and violence. This is the type of environment Safe and Drug Free Schools promotes.

With the recent results of the annual Monitoring the Future study, it is obvious that we need to continue to provide our young people with effective programs, such as Safe and Drug Free Schools, to assure positive learning environments. This year Monitoring the Future reported that nearly 55 percent of our high school seniors have used an illicit drug in the past month. In addition, the study found that nearly 50 percent of high school seniors have used marijuana in 1999 and this percentage has remained unchanged in 1998, as well as 1997. Sadly, the study also found that the percentage of 10th graders who reported use of marijuana increased from 39.6 percent in 1998 to nearly 41 percent in 1999. With these discouraging drug use and abuse trends, it is clear that we need to use every resource available for anti-drug efforts.

Safe and Drug Free Schools provides our state and local education agencies with the funding necessary to implement effective, research-based programs that prevent and reduce violence and substance abuse in our schools. Studies show a high correlation between drug use and availability and school violence. We need to create a drug-free environment to promote a safe environment.

In fact, many states have reported decreases in incidents of violence and drug use because of Safe and Drug Free Schools funds. It is imperative that we continue to provide our communities with the resources necessary to protect our children from violence and drugs.

With our leadership and support, it is certain that these disturbing trends of drug use and increasing school violence will be reduced. I am committed to providing our young people with a positive learning environment free of drugs and safe from harm.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

ARMS CONTROL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee spoke on the floor of the Senate on the subject of arms control. He is a distinguished Member of the Senate, someone for whom I have high regard, but someone with whom I have strong disagreement on this subject. I will speak this morning about the presentation he made yesterday and its relationship to a range of other issues we face.

The front page of the Washington Post this morning has a headline: "Helms Vows to Obstruct Arms Pacts, Any New Clinton Accord With Russia Ruled Out." It is a story about the presentation made yesterday by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in which he stated that any arms control agreement negotiated by this administration is going to be dead on arrival in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. With all due respect to the Washington Post, that is not news. The Foreign Relations Committee has been a morgue for arms control for a long time. In fact, this Congress has been a morgue for arms control. Everything dealing with arms control has been dead on arrival in this Congress and in that committee for several years.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference is now being held in New York. At that conference the world is looking to this country for leadership in stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons and stopping the spread of the missiles, submarines, and bombers with which those nuclear weapons are delivered. Regrettably, this country has abandoned its leadership on the arms control issue.

I will include in the RECORD several editorials: one is the April 26 edition of the Chicago Tribune entitled "Russia Takes Arms Control Lead." It discusses the Russian Duma's approval of Start II and the approval of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban treaty by the Russians. Another is from the April

26 Milwaukee Journal Sentinel entitled, "Will the United States Lead or Follow on the Issue of Arms Control." Another is from the April 27 Dallas Morning News with the title "Arms Control, the Senate Needs to Stop Playing with Nuclear Fire." And the last is this morning's column in the Washington Post by Mary McGrory entitled "Nuclear Family Values."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent these four editorials be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my statement.

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

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the statement made yesterday by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was a statement that says, we don't know what you might negotiate. It has not yet been negotiated; a proposal does not yet exist. But whatever it is and whatever it might be, we intend to kill it. It will be dead in my committee.

That is not what this country ought to be doing with the subject of arms control. As we meet in the Senate discussing a range of things, and especially discussing, more recently, the case of Elian Gonzalez, which seems to have co-opted so much attention in this country, other countries around the world aspire to acquire nuclear weapons. The spread of nuclear weapons is a very serious matter. Will more and more countries have access to nuclear bombs and the means by which to deliver those nuclear weapons, or will this country provide leadership in stopping the spread of nuclear weapons?

Arms control agreements have worked. Those in this Congress who have stopped arms control agreements and who have said any future agreements will be dead in our committee or in this Congress are wrong. It is the wrong policy for this country. Our country should instead be saying we embrace thoughtful, reasonable, arms control agreements that make this a safer world.

This picture shows some of what the Senate and the Congress have done in the past on arms control agreements and why they work. This is a picture of a missile silo. This used to hold an SS-19, a Soviet and then Russian missile. The missile in this silo had several warheads aimed at the United States of America. The threat from those warheads doesn't exist anymore. The missile is gone. The silo was filled in. The ground is plowed over and there are now sunflowers on top. Is that progress? You bet your life it is progress.

But it is not just missile silos. Here is the dismantling of a Russian Delta class ballistic missile submarine. This used to be a submarine that would find its way stealthily through the waters with missiles and nuclear warheads aimed at American cities and targets. It is no longer a submarine. Here is a piece of copper wire that is ground up

that used to be on that Russian submarine. Did we sink that submarine in hostile action? No. Through the Nunn-Lugar threat reduction program, the Pentagon actually dismantled that Russian submarine.

More than that, we are sawing the wings off Russian bombers. Here is a picture of the Nunn-Lugar program cutting the wings off TU-95 heavy bombers. Why is the Pentagon cutting the wings off those bombers? Because we have had arms control agreements with Russia that have called for the reduction of bombers, missiles, nuclear warheads. Six thousand Russian nuclear warheads have been eliminated—6,000. That is the explosive equivalent of 175,000 nuclear bombs like those dropped on Hiroshima. Let me repeat that. Arms control agreements with Russia have eliminated the threat from nuclear weapons with destructive power equivalent to 175,000 bombs the size of the nuclear bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

We have people in the Congress who say: We don't like arms control. We want to build new things. We want to build new missiles. We want to build new missile defense systems. We want to build and we want to spend money building. What they do is light the fuse of a new arms race.

Without some new effort in arms control to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons, we will see a new arms race—expensive, dangerous, and one that will hold the world hostage for some time to come. Our job ought to be to find ways to reduce the nuclear threat, not expand it; to find ways to create arms control agreements that work.

Again, I have deep respect for all of my colleagues, even those with whom I have serious disagreements. I certainly have serious disagreements in this circumstance. But I don't understand an announcement that says, whatever the President might negotiate in arms control, even though it is not yet negotiated, even though we don't know the specifics, whatever it might be with respect to arms control, we pledge to you that it is dead. That is not leadership. That is destructive to good public policy. If we can negotiate with the Russians and others sensible, thoughtful arms control agreements that advance this country's interests, enhance world safety and security, then we ought to be willing to embrace it, not shun it.

I regret very much the announcement that there will be no hearings on any negotiations on arms control. We are quick to hold hearings on the Elian Gonzalez case. We have people doing cartwheels around the Chamber saying: Let's hold hearings; let's investigate. We can hold hearings on the Elian Gonzalez case, but somehow there will be no movement, no hearings, no discussion on the issue of arms control if, God forbid, we should be able to achieve some sort of breakthrough in an arms control agreement with the Russians or others.

In conclusion, it is our responsibility, it falls on our shoulders in the United