

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for 7 minutes.

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

BUILDING CONSUMER CONFIDENCE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, in 1968 the Congress of the United States passed the Wholesome Poultry Product Act of 1968.

A former Congressman from Iowa by the name of Neal Smith—Members of the present Congress will remember—was a person who served the people of Iowa very well and spent a considerable amount of time during his years in Congress trying to build consumer confidence in poultry and other meats American consumers buy.

In 1960, there were 1.8 billion chickens produced in the United States and consumed by the public. In 1998, it was up to 8 billion chickens. There has been a very dramatic rise in the consumption of chicken by the American consumer, all the more reason to make sure the Wholesome Poultry Products Act of 1968 is followed.

There is a dismal picture painted about the inspection of poultry slaughterhouses in the United States and some question about whether the meat consumed by the American public is as wholesome as the 1968 act intended. This question arises because of a proposal in the Department of Agriculture to shift some routine Federal inspection from Federal inspectors to inspectors hired by the poultry slaughtering companies. An article was in yesterday's Des Moines Register, by Register Washington reporter George Anthan, who has been reporting on the subject of wholesome inspection of meat by the Department of Agriculture for almost his entire journalistic career. George Anthan is very much an authority on both what was intended and the enforcement of that law.

Rather than summarizing, I will read what was reported yesterday in the Des Moines Register by George Anthan.

The Agriculture Department admits consumers may detest chicken or turkey that contains pus from a pneumonia-like disease called air sacculitis.

But the condition fails to threaten human health, federal officials say, and the issue of dealing with it can be left largely to the employees of meat processing companies, rather than to federal inspectors.

The poultry condition is at the center of a dispute between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the union that represents federal inspectors over how best to safeguard America's meat.

A former Iowa Congressman, Neal Smith, says, "I suppose you could

sterilize pus and maybe it would not hurt you . . . but the fact is, we should not be eating that kind of stuff."

Continuing the article:

The Department of Agriculture is implementing a new inspection system that assigns many of the more routine duties now handled by federal inspectors to the companies they regulate. The inspectors, in turn, are supposed to look for systemic problems to prevent disease outbreaks before they happen.

But the union maintains the change breaks a sacred trust with American consumers, who see the Department of Agriculture approval as proof that an independent inspector has signed off on the meat they put on their dining room tables.

The controversy revolves around the Wholesome Poultry Products Act of 1968.

Smith said he "carefully and deliberately" included the word "wholesome" in the law's title because "people don't want to eat pus, and scabs, sores and malignant tumors."

Officials at the Department of Agriculture's Food Safety and Inspection Service said that even though inspecting birds for air sacculitis will be the responsibility of the poultry companies, federal inspectors will monitor the process.

Parenthetically, the question for the consumers in America is whether or not they can be satisfied that their food is safe because there is some Federal inspector monitoring it as opposed to Federal inspectors actually inspecting it.

Continuing the article:

They said if the inspectors determine birds with air sacculitis and other defects that don't affect human health are being passed for human consumption, they will notify companies, who are supposed to take corrective actions. "The only thing an inspector could do under the new system is inform the plant that something is going wrong," said Felicia Nestor, a food safety specialist at the Government Accountability Project, a group that supports government whistle-blowers.

"They have no club, especially over the products that already have gone out the door," Nestor said. The Department of Agriculture's office of the Inspector General recently interviewed federal inspectors at a Gold Kist, Inc., chicken processing plant at Guntersville, Ala., where the inspection system is being tested.

According to the inspector general's March 3 report, federal inspectors at the plant said that before the system was installed "the inspectors were removing bad products from the lines."

After the new system was implemented, government food inspectors "were told to stop removing products from the lines," according to the report.

Spot checks of the Guntersville plant found nine of 60 birds with air sacculitis on Feb. 5 and 20 of 70 birds on Feb. 7. The bad birds had not been removed by company employees "who had taken the place of (Department of Agriculture) line inspectors," the report said.

Air sacculitis can fill a bird's respiratory system, body cavity and hollow avian bones with pus and bacteria.

While the controversy over air sacculitis involves mainly questions about the wholesomeness of pus-filled chickens and turkeys, the disease also was linked to human health problems at a recent meeting of a Department of Agriculture advisory committee on implementing the new inspection system.

Daniel Lafontaine of Columbia, S.C., a veterinarian representing the American Veterinary Medicine Association, said he told agri-

culture officials at the meeting that "birds that have air sacculitis may be a wholesomeness issue today and a day or two later these birds may be septicemic."

After the blood stream has been invaded by virulent microorganisms, a chicken or turkey "is not safe for human consumption," said the South Carolina state meat and poultry inspection system.

Even if cooked properly, he said, "pus can get pretty gross. You sure don't want to eat it."

Kenneth Petersen, senior program manager in the Department of Agriculture's food inspection service, said birds with severe air sacculitis are supposed to be condemned by company employees.

If monitoring federal inspectors determine through twice daily checks that they aren't, the firms involved can be cited for failing to meet food safety standards, he said.

Under the new inspection system, as under traditional systems in which federal inspectors examine each carcass, birds with less serious cases of air sacculitis can be "reworked" by either cutting away pus-filled air sacs and other tissues or by using a vacuum device to remove the material, Petersen said.

"We recognize that wholesomeness issues are also important and we check for them," Petersen said. "But our emphasis is on those things that may cause an ailment. So, we are seeking an appropriate balance."

I ask the consumers of America to be aware, as they buy chicken and turkey, of whether or not the wholesomeness act of 1968 is being followed by the Congress of the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I inquire where we are. Are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA ON EDUCATION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise this morning to talk about education. It appears that we will spend most of our time this week talking about the importance of our public education system to America's children and to our Nation's future.

Long ago, the United States recognized the value of an educational system that is available and accessible to everyone. We knew the tremendous sophistication of a democracy or a representative republic, and that to sustain it we would have to have a well-educated populace—not only to understand it and to believe in it but to further it. That was part of the genesis of the public school system in our country, along with the tremendous value to our citizenry, to be able to say they were educated. That was our goal.

As we start a debate on the Educational Opportunities Act this week, that will continue to be the ultimate goal of the Republicans—the assurance of a strong, growing, reliable, and capable public school system to provide the very best education and the very best educational system to all of our citizens and to all of their children. Though it appears this is the number

one issue in the minds of the American people—and everywhere you poll, you find education is—I am saddened that at least here on the floor this week it will become a decidedly partisan issue.

Accusations will fly from the Democrats' side; they will claim that the Clinton-Gore administration has done its job in the promotion of its policies, and that they care more about children than we do. But I think the debate this week, if listened to, will become very clear. Every Senator, either Democrat or Republican, should have the same goal in mind, and that is to provide to our children the very best education possible. The very foundation for that is our public education system. What this debate this week is really about, though, if you listen closely is a difference in philosophies about how we get to the best system in the world. Or how do we improve what is already good and make it better?

The Democrats are going to tell you they want more of your tax dollars to stay in Washington to pay for another Federal bureaucrat to do another study, to construct a one-size-fits-all national policy, or to ensure that only 65 cents out of every dollar actually gets to the classroom in America. That is what this debate is going to be about, in part. They will defend the status quo in an ever-increasing Washington, DC, involvement in our children's education. They will defend the increasingly intrusive Federal involvement in State and local educational systems.

We, at the Federal level, have always believed the responsibility of educating was at the State level. That is why every State has a department of education or an educational system. It has only been in the last few years that we have increasingly begun to put more Federal dollars into the public school system. Even as we have done that by the billions of dollars over the last decade, still only about 7.5 cents to 8 cents out of every Federal dollar are spent in the classroom. So even with our increased involvement, we still historically have erred on the side of the local community and the State government to be the primary providers of public education.

The same system I talk about now, is the system in which the Clinton-Gore regime has denied many students the basic education they deserve by stifling some of our creativity.

Republicans say it is time for a change, and we are taking action.

This week, on the floor of the Senate, we will be considering S. 2, the Educational Opportunity Act, which does just that. It offers a fundamental change in the way the Federal Government involves itself in public education. Republicans say it is time to put decisions back in the hands of parents and back in the hands of teachers. Our bill includes provisions that give States and school districts more flexibility in how they spend their Federal tax dollars. If you go to a principal's

office or superintendent's office today and ask what the Federal tax dollar means to them, while they say it is important, they will say: Look around you; 45 to 50 percent of our staff is here to fill out the Federal forms to get the 7.5 cents out of every dollar we get.

That is part of the bureaucracy that has been allowed to build, that the Clinton-Gore administration has aggressively perpetuated over the last eight years.

Republicans say every school is different and has different needs, and Washington, DC, should not decide how to spend the money in Midvale, Idaho. I happened to pick Midvale because that is the small rural school from which I graduated. While I graduated 37 years ago, and there were only 10 in my high school graduating class, there aren't many more than that today. In fact, the public school I grew up in has fewer students in the whole school than in one grade level at one Washington, DC, school. It is a small, rural school. That school does not need money to reduce its class sizes. That school needs money to connect itself to the Internet or to buy books, to improve its library, to improve the ability of students to research in a much broader arena than modern technology allows today. We don't need more teachers, and we don't need smaller class sizes. Yet that is the single loudest mantra you have heard coming from the lips of AL GORE or Bill Clinton.

Our bill doesn't do that. Our bill allows school districts with fewer than 600 students to combine funds to improve student achievement. Republicans believe it is wrong to let even one child slip through the cracks, be it an urban crack or a rural countryside crack. That is why our bill gives schools and teachers increased authority to meet the needs of the disadvantaged students while requiring accountability.

Republicans believe our children deserve the best qualified teachers available. Our bill helps school districts hire and retain the best qualified teachers and empower those teachers to continue to learn and improve so they can increasingly become better educators.

Republicans believe schools should be among the most safe places in the United States. Our bill strengthens the Safe and Drug Free School Program. Why should our schools not be a sanctuary and a haven in which all students can feel safety and trust? I think they will not learn well unless they see their schools in that light.

Republicans recognize the value of speaking multiple languages and the importance of being fluent in English. Our bill gives a helping hand to those whose first language is not English. Republicans recognize the presence of the Federal Government is a drain on the local infrastructure. Our bill fortifies programs designed to meet part of the Federal Government's responsibility to local communities.

Republicans believe we have a special commitment to native students, whether they are in the lower 48 or Alaska or Hawaii. Our bill gives these students a helping hand to help them compete in our modern world.

Again, the real debate this week is not who cares most about educating our children. It is a fundamental, philosophical debate about the best ways to allow our children to achieve. It talks about the stark contrast of a large Federal bureaucracy and new Federal ideas being thrust upon the States and local communities because Washington knows every child, and Washington knows better. I am afraid Democrats are going to continue to preach about the failed policies of the Clinton-Gore administration by keeping tax dollars within the beltway, saying that is the way you educate a child in Midvale, Idaho.

This week we will say enough is enough. It will be a debate about a different approach: returning the money to the local school districts and to the States and empowering them to make those choices.

Let's get that hard-earned tax dollar out of the beltway, out of the hands of the bureaucrat, and into the hands of the well-meaning teachers and parents. Let's tie the money to the child so the parent and the child can seek out and find the very best education that child deserves.

Those are the differences I think will be a part of the baseline of the debate this week on the floor of the Senate.

I hope America listens, because we need the best public school system in the world. It is a good one, but it is not the best. To make something good better or best is to empower people at local levels to make decisions for their children—the kinds of decisions that parents instinctively know, but bureaucrats in Washington somehow have never understood.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, later today the Senate will officially begin the debate on S. 2, the Educational Opportunities Act. I am pleased we will finally have the opportunity to discuss our ideas for improving elementary and secondary education. Of course, one of the reasons we are discussing elementary and secondary education this year is that the ESEA, the statute authorizing most of the Federal Government's education programs in this area, is expiring. I should assure everyone that even though there is no reauthorization bill, it is possible to continue the ESEA programs through the annual appropriations process.

The time has come to act. The American people have been sending us a message to do something to improve America's schools. I agree with the American people about the importance of this issue. If we can get education

right in this country, almost everything else should follow. A better educated citizenry will give us an advantage in technology and national defense, better trade and economic opportunities, better citizenship and stronger values, a reduction in crime, and, of course, more personal fulfillment for our citizens. This is an important debate, one of great significance for our Nation.

The bad news is that in the coming days there will be so much politics and partisan acrimony emanating from the floor and that many people who watch us might wonder whether it is worth the trouble. The good news is that if concerned Americans listen closely to this debate and have the patience to endure the political sound and fury, I believe they will see their concerns are taken seriously by the majority.

It is important to keep in mind that the Federal Government's share of America's total education expenditures is quite small, about 7 percent. As a result, Federal attention has been focused on a few specific objectives:

First, providing a quality education that can help offset the effects of poverty and social distress that many of our students experience. It is wrong to expect less of minority and poor students. They can do very well.

Second, improving teacher quality and accountability is critical—teaching the English language to students who do not know it well, particularly in my State and other States in which we have had a real upswing in immigration with students coming to this country who are not as fluent in English as the others.

Third, promoting familiarity with technology, which is the future.

And, of course, providing a safe school environment.

These are the things on which we will focus.

Unfortunately, after some 35 years, the record of progress toward these objectives at the Federal level is not impressive. I believe this record of failure stands as an indictment of the traditional ESEA strategy, which is to establish a new division of the Federal Government in Washington, DC, and put a small army of people to work writing regulations and processing paperwork from the States.

A promising alternative approach has emerged, and this new alternative is known as Straight A's. The idea behind the Straight A's phrase is very similar to the idea that led to our success with welfare reform. It is a concept of a Federal-State performance partnership as in welfare. We do not measure the success in welfare by how many people we have on welfare or how much money we spend on welfare. We decided to begin measuring success on how few people we had to have on welfare and how little we had to spend.

We have to get to the same kind of performance-based criteria with respect to education, not how many kids we have in some remedial program but

how few we have in those kinds of programs because our education system is working to educate our young people. This is the concept of accountability at the State and local level.

When Congress took on welfare in 1995 and 1996, the prerequisite for our success in passing significant reforms was a recognition that very promising ideas were being developed by leaders at the State and local government level. We rejected the old premise that "Washington knows best," and we allowed these innovators outside of what we call the Washington beltway to actually pursue some bold, innovative ideas without a lot of strings attached from Washington.

We have all seen what the result can be. We all understand how welfare reform has been working now to get people off welfare and into a productive capacity in our society. It is time to consider the same possibilities with respect to education.

The HELP Committee's bill permits as many as 15 States to enter into Straight A's performance contracts if they choose to. These contracts will allow significant flexibility for innovation by these States. My guess is, as we saw with education flexibility, the bill we passed earlier—the Ed-Flex bill—the other States will want to participate in this, so it will quickly move from a 15-State demonstration project to one in which all 50 States want the right to participate.

I am sure we will hear objections from the same folks who posited objections to welfare reform. They will say it is a risky scheme; you cannot trust the States and local leaders to do this; Washington knows best. Given the Federal Government's record over the last 35 years, this reactionary posture is impossible to sustain. We cannot keep doing things the same old way and expect different results.

I expect, just as with welfare reform, the American people will come to agree with the majority and at least some members of the minority who have now concluded that flexibility, combined with accountability, can bring needed change to education, where control by the bureaucrats in Washington has failed.

I also look forward to debating proposals aimed at enhancing parents' influence over the decisions affecting their children, especially when a student must overcome poverty or a language barrier. The stakes are very high, and we should not tolerate a system that ignores the views of the people with the keenest appreciation of that fact—parents.

The committee-passed bill recognizes that choice must be available to children in failing or unsafe schools, and I welcome this recognition and urge the greatest possible expansion of choice and competition.

In fact, I am proud that my own State of Arizona has provided leadership in this area by establishing an open enrollment policy that allows par-

ents to enroll a child in any public school of their choice, undeterred by artificial geographic boundaries, and that this latitude has led to the creation of hundreds of new charter schools in Arizona. That has, in turn, improved the traditional public schools with which these charter schools compete.

In fact, I was buoyed to see in the big newspaper at home in August a couple of years ago one of our better public school districts put a full-page ad in the newspaper saying to the parents: We are having to compete with these charter schools. We were losing enrollment to these schools. We figured out what we were doing wrong, and we have improved. Come back to our public school system and see what a great program we have.

That kind of competition and innovation has caused improvement, and we have seen it in our own State of Arizona.

As the author of the Dollars Follow the Students Act, which is the first piece of Federal legislation to advance this idea of making these aid dollars portable, I am heartened the bill we are going to consider will provide unprecedented portability for students aided by title I, which is our largest Federal education program.

There are those who will resist the idea of choice and competition in education. But I am looking forward to this debate.

No American child should be trapped in a school that cannot guarantee a quality education and a safe education. We have an obligation to provide a lifeline for families whose schools are failing, particularly those families who live in our country's most disadvantaged areas.

So once again, I urge the American people to follow this debate closely. If they do, I think they will find that we have been listening to their calls for change and for real reform. That is what the legislation we will be bringing to the floor today will provide. I am looking forward to this debate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to continue in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I am excited that we are launching ourselves into what may be a week or more of debate and discussion and, hopefully, success in the area of education and educational funding.

Looking back over time, I think there is probably no other issue we have talked more about than education. I think polls and discussions in

town meetings would indicate that education is probably the highest priority issue in the country.

Everybody knows the future of our children—and of the country—depends on education. We will be talking about that during debate of this bill, and I hope we can agree on some positive results.

Unfortunately, I think it is fair to say that when we enter into a year of this kind, particularly with the Presidential election, we find ourselves faced with more emphasis on creating issues than creating solutions. I hope that is not the case during this education debate.

I am sure there is nothing to which we have more commitment or in which we have more intense beliefs than our schools—by “we” I mean all of us: Parents, communities, people all over the country. We are all involved in educating our children. It is a most important part of our lives.

This weekend, I met with the alumni association of the University of Wyoming. It caused me to reflect on the things that were basic to my life and reminded me of changes that need to be made.

I think most of us are proud of our schools. I am especially proud of the schools in my State of Wyoming. They are rural schools, generally, that are relatively small. The population in our State is low. But when those kids come here to visit, through programs such as Close Up or others, when they come here to serve as interns or come here to serve in the Senate, I am very proud. Our education system must be doing well for these young people to be here.

Can we make it better? Of course. That is what we are challenged to do, to make an even better opportunity for our children. We need to be able to help our schools to be flexible enough to change, as the world changes, as our economy changes.

Again, going back to this weekend, we were talking about the relatively small number of young people who have graduated from the University, or even from our high schools, who are equipped with the kind of technological expertise they'll need as we enter this new economy. We need to make sure they're ready to answer the call.

As the Presiding Officer has said so eloquently, we are coming forth this week with an educational agenda. I think it is a very strong agenda. It is the product of much work on the part of the committee that is bringing it forth. It tends to emphasize moving controls to parents. After all, that has really been the controversial issue we have addressed in all of our conversations; that is: Where should the decisions be made? Who really should fit the educational program to the community and their needs?

By all means, we need to reflect on it and measure it against the rest of the country, especially since our population is becoming much more tran-

sient. For example, a person living in Cody, WY, as I did, may not live there forever. We have to have some relative comparison between schools, which we do have. But we need to tailor those programs, particularly Federal assistance, to fit our specific needs.

Educational needs in Meeteetse, WY, are much different from those in Pittsburgh, PA. We need to make sure the Federal dollars—and it has already been pointed out it is a relatively small amount, about 7 or 8 percent of the total—are used in the classroom and not set aside for the bureaucracy.

We need to give families more of a role in education with greater educational choice.

This morning, we had a visit from a RespectTeen group. I brought them onto the floor. There was one student from each State. A young man who had been chosen to come here had done a study and a paper on education. His paper focused on the importance of family involvement in schools. I was very impressed with the ideas about ways to get parents more directly involved with the education of their children.

We need, of course, to support exceptional teachers. We need to help teachers be prepared to teach. We need to encourage people to come into that profession. We need to provide attractive opportunities for them to stay in that profession. I guess I am especially interested in that since my wife is a teacher.

But it is very important to focus on basic academics.

That is what we aim to do. We have an opportunity to make some changes, to set some goals and some objectives. I am afraid that, too often perhaps, individually, and certainly institutionally, we become wrapped up in doing the things we are doing and, as a result, do not sit down regularly and ask ourselves: Where are we? Where do we want to go? What are our objectives? What do we need to do to get there?

I think we can fairly easily define the goals we want to accomplish in education. But I am not sure we define very well how to make the process of achieving them more effective.

We also need to address the issue of accountability. We spend a great deal of money in education, which we need to do. However, frankly, money alone does not ensure a good education for our children. We have seen the results of simply throwing out money and not having some system of accountability.

What we have had in this administration is a commitment to a whole series of Federal mandates and programs—for example, 100,000 Federally funded teachers. It has already been pointed out this morning that there are school districts in which providing additional teachers to reduce class size is unnecessary. The needs are in other places. That is why priorities need to be decided locally. Sometimes the mandate is for Federal construction. Again, that need may exist in one place but not in another.

So what we are really talking about is having some accountability, having some local flexibility, helping disadvantaged children meet higher standards, improving teacher quality, enriching the incentives for students to be prepared for a life of success, having safe and drug-free schools—we can do more in these areas.

Increasing educational opportunities is what this bill is all about. This is not a proposal for private school vouchers, but it does give an opportunity for mobility. If these kids are in a school that is not adequate, they can go to another public school and possibly improve.

I think it is exciting that we are moving ahead. I hope we can do so with the objective of passing a bill that will strengthen education in this country.

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

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, since we have a few more minutes before we have to end this morning's session, I will take a moment to comment on a few things the Presiding Officer said a little while ago. There are two points I will make.

The first has to do with the percentage of funds the Federal Government spends on primary and secondary education. The second is more general.

The Senator from Wyoming made the point that about 7 percent of the money spent in local schools comes from the Federal Government. It is also true that the average proportion of paperwork imposed on State and local schools by Federal mandates is about 50 percent. In my State of Arizona, it is about 45 percent. Why is that and what is the effect of that? That goes to the heart of what we are proposing to change.

We understand it is not a good economic bargain to give the States \$7 for education and to make them spend \$3.50 of that on administration. Yet that is exactly what is happening.

Why is this so? States and school districts see pots of Federal money. There are over 100 different Federal programs for which States and local school districts can qualify. Sometimes they have to have matching funds. In most cases, they have to submit a lot of paperwork in order to get this money from the Federal Government. So even if it is only \$20,000 or \$30,000, a school district will hire an administrator to apply for the money, to fill out the forms, to provide the follow-up information, and then to administer that money when it finally comes. The net result is that about half of the money in administration is spent to get this 7 percent.

There is no surprise, therefore, that so many of the people the school districts hire are not teachers. That has an impact on education. It is one of the reasons why over the last many years, as the Federal Government has dangled these relatively small chunks of funding out to the schools, the schools, in order to get that funding, have jumped through more and more hoops, have spent more and more time and effort and more and more dollars chasing after that relatively small amount of Federal money.

This is inefficient. It is uneconomical. That is not to say the original ideas for the Federal programs were bad ideas. We are smart people in Washington. We come up with all kinds of great ideas. Therefore, we provide funding to implement those ideas. We say: If you will only jump through these various hoops, you can get some Federal funding for this particular great idea. The problem is, that is a very inefficient way to use taxpayer dollars.

It makes a lot more sense to say to the States: We have about 7 percent of the funding for your schools. If you will figure out how you can best spend that money on your own, let us know, set your own goals and make sure you meet those goals at the end of the year—in other words, there still has to be accountability—we will send the money to you without having to have these armies of bureaucrats filling out the forms and administering the Federal programs based upon the ideas we think are great.

It will probably turn out that a lot of those great ideas are implemented by the local schools but they won't always be implemented in every place. As the Presiding Officer noted, one school may need that money to decrease class sizes, to hire more teachers. Another may need that money to hook everybody up to the Internet. Another may want to focus on some kinds of remedial programs in math or reading, for example, tutorial kinds of programs. There are all different kinds of specific needs in specific school districts.

We, in Washington, should not suppose we know best what each school needs, nor should we assume that if we just throw money at the problems, we will get better education.

It turns out that the States that spend the least amount on education are among those with best test scores. There are a lot of different reasons for that. It is also true that where we spend the most money, we have the worst test scores—right here in Washington, DC. So there is no direct correlation between the expenditure of money and a good education. It is where you put your funds, how you make use of those funds, how you prioritize.

That is what we want to address with this change in policy. No longer will everybody have to apply for these little grants and go through all of the hoops that it takes, fill out all of the paper-

work, and then follow that paperwork throughout the years. Rather, we are hoping, at least for some States, we are going to create a contract whereby they can apply for the funds at the beginning on the basis of a very general set of goals that they establish, without all of the paperwork required to meet the Federal goals. They can set their own goals and, at the end of the year, demonstrate to us by a good accountability of how they have done whether or not the expenditure of those funds has worked to achieve their goals. If it has, then they can continue to apply for these funds in the future. If not, then they have to be relegated to the same old program they are under today, where they have to continue to apply for each individual program, spend all of the money to do that, and be relegated to this very inefficient way of getting the Federal dollars to them.

That is the essence of what we are trying to do—free up those dollars so people at the local level who know best what to do with them can put the money toward the goals they establish and not have to spend half of the money on administering the programs so that none of that money gets down to the kids we are trying to teach.

The second point is—I mentioned this earlier—if we get education right in our country, almost everything else will follow. Let me illustrate.

First of all, we will have an advantage in national defense. Why did I mention that first? We are the only superpower in the world right now, and we have the technology in our defense to beat anybody in the world should they challenge us. That technology is not static. It is dynamic. If we don't train the young people to continue to innovate, to continue to invent new things which will enable us not only to progress as a civilian society but also to have the capability to defend ourselves with new types of defense technology, we will not stay on top. The history of the world is littered with countries that at one time were on top but did not maintain their edge.

I was talking to some astronauts one day. I said: "What is the difference between you and your Russian counterparts who go up in space with you?" They said: "There isn't any difference; they are just like we are." I said: "Well, surely there has to be something." One of them said: "Well, I can tell you a story. When something goes wrong up there, we immediately get on our computers and try to figure out how to fix it."

"Our Russian friends get out their tablet of paper and pencil and they start doing the math, the algorithms, long division, calculus, whatever it takes, to figure out what to do."

I think there are two lessons in that. First of all, it is wonderful that, as a society, we are all trained in the use of computers, and we have everything so computer-literate that we can quickly figure out the answer. But the second

lesson is that we also have to have people who understand what the Russian scientists do—the long math, the calculus—to be able to figure all of this out, because it is only by knowing that that you can program the computers to do the things we can do with computers.

Somebody has to understand the fundamental science. People in other countries are still being educated the old-fashioned way, using the fundamentals. We have to have enough people in this country who are educated in the fundamentals to maintain our technological superiority, while at the same time making the calculations from computers available to all of society to enable us to rapidly advance in all the different areas in which we have advanced.

But if we lose this technological edge because we are no longer educating our citizenry—at least the best and brightest—in the fundamentals of math and science, we will lose this edge. That is why I said we can maintain an edge in defense only if we continue to have the best educated citizenry in the world. Today, we have to import many scientists and computer specialists from other countries, and it demonstrates to us that we are not doing a good enough job of educating our own citizenry.

The same thing applies to better trade and economic opportunities. If we continue to be the inventors of the world and to take those inventions and create applications that make our lives better, we will continue to have the best products in the world that others want to buy, and we will maintain our general superiority in trade. But if we don't provide the education to our students to be able to continue to put out these kinds of products, if we become mostly a service-oriented society, other societies will take up the slack and will gain the advantage in trade and economic opportunities. As I said, we would have a better citizenry.

We have to continue not only to train people in science and math, but also in history, in learning the lessons of life from other subjects that enable us to work better as a society as we become more and more diverse, and to remember the key lessons of our Founding Fathers who understood that our democratic-republican form of government could not continue in perpetuity without a well-educated citizenry—a citizenry understanding the issues of the day because they had to make the decisions.

This is a do-it-yourself government, America. Our people vote on things; they have to be well enough informed to elect good representatives to represent them in the places of our representative government—the legislative branches of government, for example. If they are not engaged enough in the issues of the day to make intelligent decisions, then obviously the people they send here will likewise not be so educated. The quality of decision-making and public policy will falter.

Moreover, the understanding of their role in our government will gradually diminish.

Abraham Lincoln was very concerned about this. He said often that one of his big fears was that, little by little, each generation would lose some understanding of the ideas of the Founding Fathers and why the perpetuation of those ideas was so critical to the continuation of our democratic-republican form of government—the notion of citizen participation, the understanding of the checks and balances of our government, why we set the government up the way we did.

Frankly, I was distressed during the time of the impeachment trial of the President—whatever you think of the outcome of that trial—about the lack of understanding of a lot of my fellow citizens about what that was all about, why we had such a procedure, why it was important to maintain the rule of law, and so on. These are subjects that our great-great-grandparents were well versed in from their education. They studied them long and hard. I am distressed that today our kids and grandkids don't take the humanities courses in college that we took, which brought us a real knowledge of the underpinnings of the philosophy of our government, our society, our civilization.

Our students today are caught up in all kinds of studies of minorities of one kind or another and in other fads of the day. They are not as well educated about the traditional concepts. In fact, some even assault these concepts as inapplicable to today's world, when in point of fact, the lessons of the great philosophers are totally applicable. You will find philosophers on every side of every issue. If you study them well, you will appreciate and understand the problems of today, the kinds of choices we should be making in our society today.

History is relevant and, as has been noted many times, those who ignore history are bound to repeat it. That was said in the context of the bad times of history—primarily the wars that have to be fought—because we don't understand that history. So a better education provides better citizenship.

It can provide stronger values because we study the great books and the philosophers who wrestled with the questions of what is the meaning of life and how we should conduct ourselves. There is a difference between right and wrong. There are truths and there are values. Young people today are not reminded that in the Declaration of Independence, our founders said there are "inalienable rights," and "we hold these truths to be self-evident." There were some things that are so true and we understand that. They were self-evident. But today, relativism has begun to teach our kids that there is no real truth, there is no definite right and wrong; there are only shades of gray.

If society comes to believe that and bases decisions upon that misunder-

standing, then we cannot long survive as a free society, as a society founded on the principle that there are certain truths, and that part of those truths are that there are inalienable rights that are given to us by our Creator—not by some government. We then begin to rely upon government to do things because it is the benevolence of government that is the basis for our rights. Wrong. Government doesn't give us any rights. The best we can expect from government is the protection of our God-given rights. But if generations are not taught that, then we won't be able to make public decisions on the same foundation that our Founding Fathers understood were so important to future generations.

A reduction in crime. If we have a well-educated citizenry, we are going to have less crime. I think it is absolutely wrong to believe that people from disadvantaged backgrounds have to be relegated to a life of crime, that they somehow aren't as capable as everybody else at learning and improving their lives and staying free from a life of crime. It is so at odds with the fundamental precepts of our country that I can't believe people would still expect less of students in these kinds of communities.

Our proposal, as the Presiding Officer noted, is to recognize that everybody is entitled to an equal opportunity for education, and we cannot expect less of those in our most distressed areas. But if we don't give them the same opportunity to go to areas where they can get a good education and have safe schools that provide a quality education, then we are, in effect, saying: You are second class, you just can't make it, and we are not going to bother to give you the tools to make it. That is fundamentally wrong and un-American.

Finally, a good education—if we get it right—will allow for more personal fulfillment. We all want to make the very best of our God-given talents, to do the very best we can in life, because most of us, toward the end of our lives, begin reflecting on why we are here and what was so important about our life and what we want to leave behind.

We speak in terms of legacies. The reality is that most of us begin saying, well, did we make the most of what we had? We all have wonderful talents given to us, and we feel very good about ourselves and our lives if we have been able to take advantage of those talents, if we have fulfilled our expectations. Yet we know today we are not challenging our young students as much as we could be. It is a crime to me that we don't challenge them to the ultimate, the maximum, so they can make the most of what God has given them. We fail them if we don't do that. If we are so lazy and so wrong about the way we provide an educational opportunity that we don't challenge them to be the very best they can be, that is the worst thing we can do for our young people today. That is why I said

if we get education right, everything else will follow in our society, and that is why I think it is the most important thing we can do.

I was asked by a journalist: If you could do one thing in public policy as a member of the Federal Government, what would it be? I said: Well, other than ensuring our national security, which we have to put that first because that is the difference between life and death for all of our people, I would allow real choice in education so that people would be able to go to the place where they thought they could get the best education for their kids wherever that might be, and that the Federal Government not stand in the way of the exercise of that choice. And the very exercise of that choice would ensure a quality education and a safe education because the people who provide the education would have to rise to the challenge. They would have to understand that they would no longer be in business if people didn't come to them. If students didn't come, they wouldn't be able to educate. But if they did a good job, the students would come. It can be done.

I visited a school district in Arizona not long ago—the Alhambra School District—not a wealthy school district. There are a lot of minorities there. Carol Peck is the superintendent. She told me there are 39 different languages and dialects spoken at that school. Yet they have achievement at that school because they have innovative administrators and teachers and the kids learn.

We can learn lessons from that if we will allow innovation at the local level—if we will not bind them by all of these Federal rules and regulations. If we will lay those aside and at least let the small amount of Federal money that goes to local schools be used in an innovative way, we will begin to remove the barriers to innovation, and we will provide quality education for our kids.

As I said in the beginning, just like welfare reform, we can succeed if we will just throw off the old ideas and allow innovation to prosper at the local level and at the parental level—and among our teachers, who, after all, are on the front lines of this wonderful opportunity we have.

I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair. I thought since we had a little extra time I would embellish a little bit on the remarks I made.

I thank the Presiding Officer for setting aside this time for us to focus on this particular subject, and for the great job he has done over the many months in which he has been in charge in the effort to take some morning business time like this so we can all express ourselves on subjects that we are about to debate. I think the upcoming education debate is the most important debate we can engage in as a Senate.

RECESS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess until 1 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:43 a.m., recessed until 1:02 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KYL).

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report S. 2.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2) to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Educational Opportunities Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. References.

Sec. 3. Short title; purpose; definitions.

TITLE I—HELPING DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN MEET HIGH STANDARDS

Sec. 101. Policy and purpose.

Sec. 102. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 103. Reservation and allocation for school improvement.

PART A—BASIC PROGRAMS

Sec. 111. State plans.

Sec. 112. Local educational agency plans.

Sec. 113. Eligible school attendance areas.

Sec. 114. Schoolwide programs.

Sec. 115. Targeted assistance schools.

Sec. 116. Pupil safety and family school choice.

Sec. 117. Assessment and local educational agency and school improvement.

Sec. 118. Assistance for school support and improvement.

Sec. 119. Parental involvement.

Sec. 120. Professional development.

Sec. 120A. Participation of children enrolled in private schools.

Sec. 120B. Early childhood education.

Sec. 120C. Allocations.

Sec. 120D. Establishment of the child centered program.

PART B—EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS

Sec. 121. Even start family literacy programs.

PART C—EDUCATION OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN

Sec. 131. Program purpose.

Sec. 132. State application.

Sec. 133. Comprehensive plan.

Sec. 134. Coordination.

PART D—PARENTAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 141. Parental assistance.

PART E—GENERAL PROVISIONS; COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM; ASSISTANCE TO ADDRESS SCHOOL DROPOUT PROBLEMS

Sec. 151. General provisions; comprehensive school reform; assistance to address school dropout problems.

TITLE II—PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS

Sec. 201. Teacher quality.

Sec. 202. Leadership education and development program.

Sec. 203. Reading excellence.

Sec. 204. National Writing Project.

Sec. 205. General provisions.

Sec. 206. New century program and digital education content collaborative.

Sec. 207. Conforming amendments.

TITLE III—ENRICHMENT INITIATIVES

Sec. 301. Enrichment initiatives.

Sec. 302. Dissemination of advanced placement information.

Sec. 303. Technical and conforming amendments.

TITLE IV—SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

Sec. 401. Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Sec. 402. Gun-free requirements.

Sec. 403. School safety and violence prevention.

Sec. 404. Background checks.

Sec. 405. Constitutionality of memorial services and memorials at public schools.

Sec. 406. Environmental tobacco smoke.

TITLE V—EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY INITIATIVES

Sec. 501. Educational opportunity initiatives.

PART A—TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

Sec. 511. Technology education.

PART B—WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY; STAR SCHOOLS

Sec. 521. Women's educational equity.

Sec. 522. Star schools.

PART C—MAGNET SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE

Sec. 531. Magnet schools assistance.

PART D—PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOLS

Sec. 541. Public charter schools.

PART E—CIVIC EDUCATION; FIE; ELLENDER FELLOWSHIPS; READY-TO-LEARN TELEVISION; INEXPENSIVE BOOK DISTRIBUTION

Sec. 551. Civic education; FIE; Ellender fellowships; ready-to-learn television; inexpensive book distribution.

PART F—TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 561. Technical and conforming amendments.

TITLE VI—INNOVATIVE EDUCATION

Sec. 601. Innovative education.

Sec. 602. Technical and conforming amendment.

TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Sec. 701. Purpose.

Sec. 702. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 703. Repeal of program development and implementation grants.

Sec. 704. Program enhancement projects.

Sec. 705. Comprehensive school and systemwide improvement grants.

Sec. 706. Repeal of systemwide improvement grants.

Sec. 707. Applications.

Sec. 708. Repeal of intensified instruction.

Sec. 709. Repeal of subgrants, priority, and coordination provisions.

Sec. 710. Evaluations.

Sec. 711. Research.

Sec. 712. Academic excellence awards.

Sec. 713. State grant program.

Sec. 714. National Clearinghouse.

Sec. 715. Instructional materials development.

Sec. 716. Training for all teachers program.

Sec. 717. Graduate fellowships.

Sec. 718. Repeal of program requirements.

Sec. 719. Program evaluations.

Sec. 720. Special rule.

Sec. 721. Repeal of finding relating to foreign language assistance.

Sec. 722. Foreign language assistance applications.

Sec. 723. Emergency immigrant education purpose.

Sec. 724. Emergency immigrant education State administrative costs.

Sec. 725. Conforming amendments.

Sec. 726. Emergency immigrant education authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 727. Coordination and reporting requirements.

TITLE VIII—IMPACT AID

Sec. 801. Short title.

Sec. 802. Purpose.

Sec. 803. Payments relating to Federal acquisition of real property.

Sec. 804. Payments for eligible federally connected children.

Sec. 805. Sudden and substantial increases in attendance of military dependents.

Sec. 806. School construction and facility modernization.

Sec. 807. State consideration of payments in providing State aid.

Sec. 808. Federal administration.

Sec. 809. Administrative hearings and judicial review.

Sec. 810. Forgiveness of overpayments.

Sec. 811. Applicability.

Sec. 812. Definitions.

Sec. 813. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 814. Technical and conforming amendment.

TITLE IX—INDIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION

Sec. 901. Programs.

Sec. 902. Conforming amendments.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 10001. Uniform provisions.

Sec. 10002. Evaluations.

Sec. 10003. America's Education Goals.

Sec. 10004. America's Education Goals Panel.

Sec. 10005. Comprehensive regional assistance centers.

Sec. 10006. Repeals.

Sec. 10007. Technical and conforming amendments.

TITLE XI—AMENDMENTS TO OTHER LAWS**PART A—REPEALS**

Sec. 11101. Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

Sec. 11102. Higher Education Amendments of 1998.

Sec. 11103. Conforming amendments.

PART B—EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH

Sec. 11201. Statement of policy.

Sec. 11202. Grants for State and local activities.

Sec. 11203. Local educational agency grants.

Sec. 11204. Secretarial responsibilities.

Sec. 11205. Definitions.

Sec. 11206. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 11207. Conforming amendments.

PART C—ALBERT EINSTEIN DISTINGUISHED EDUCATORS

Sec. 11301. Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Act of 1994.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.).

SEC. 3. SHORT TITLE; PURPOSE; DEFINITIONS.

The Act (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) is amended—
(1) in the heading for section 1, by striking “**TABLE OF CONTENTS**” and inserting “**SHORT TITLE**”; and
(2) by adding after section 1 the following:

“SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

“It is the purpose of this Act to support programs and activities that will improve the Nation's schools and enable all children to achieve high standards.

“SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

“Except as otherwise provided, in this Act:

“(1) **AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided otherwise by State law or this paragraph, the term ‘average daily attendance’ means—