

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD REMAIN ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE TO PROMOTE LONG-TERM PEACE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 521, S. Res. 272.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 272) expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should remain actively engaged in southeastern Europe to promote long-term peace, stability, and prosperity; continue to vigorously oppose the brutal regime of Slobodan Milosevic while supporting the efforts of the democratic opposition; and fully implement the Stability Pact.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO's) March 24, 1999 through June 10, 1999 bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia focused the attention of the international community of southeastern Europe;

Whereas the international community, in particular the United States and the European Union, made a commitment at the conclusion of the bombing campaign to integrate southeastern Europe into the broader European community;

Whereas there is an historic opportunity for the international community to help the people of southeastern Europe break the cycle of violence, retribution, and revenge and move towards respect for minority rights, establishment of the rule of law, and the further development of democratic governments;

Whereas the Stability Pact was established in July 1999 with the goal of promoting cooperation among the countries of southeastern Europe, with a focus on long-term political stability and peace, security, democratization, and economic reconstruction and development;

Whereas the effective implementation of the Stability Pact is important to the long-term peace and stability in the region;

Whereas the people and Government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have a positive record of respect for minority rights, the rule of law, and democratic traditions since independence;

Whereas the people of Croatia have recently elected leaders that respect minority rights, the rule of law, and democratic traditions;

Whereas positive development in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Republic of Croatia will clearly indicate to the people of Serbia that economic program and integration into the international community is only possibly if Milosevic is removed from power; and

Whereas the Republic of Slovenia continues to serve as a model for the region as it moves closer to European Union and NATO membership: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,*

That the Senate—

(1) welcomes the tide of democratic change in southeastern Europe, particularly the free

and fair elections in Croatia, and the regional cooperation taking place under the umbrella of the Stability Pact;

(2) recognizes that in this trend, the regime of Slobodan Milosevic is ever more an anomaly, the only government in the region not democratically elected, and an obstacle to peace and neighborly relations in the region;

(3) expresses its sense that the United States cannot have normal relations with Belgrade as long as the Milosevic regime is in power;

(4) views Slobodan Milosevic as a brutal indicted war criminal, responsible for immeasurable bloodshed, ethnic hatred, and human rights abuses in southeastern Europe in recent years;

(5) considers international sanctions an essential tool to isolate the Milosevic regime and promote democracy, and urges the Administration to intensify, focus, and expand those sanctions that most effectively target the regime and its key supporters;

(6) supports strongly the efforts of the Serbian people to establish a democratic government and endorses their call for early, free, and fair elections;

(7) looks forward to establishing a normal relationship with a new democratic government in Serbia, which will permit an end to Belgrade's isolation and the opportunity to restore the historically friendly relations between the Serbian and American people;

(8) expresses the readiness of the Senate, once there is a democratic government in Serbia, to review conditions for Serbia's full reintegration into the international community;

(9) expresses its readiness to assist a future democratic government in Serbia to build a democratic, peaceful, and prosperous society, based on the same principle of respect for international obligations, as set out by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the United Nations, which guide the relations of the United States with other countries in southeastern Europe;

(10) calls upon the United States and other Western democracies to publicly announce and demonstrate to the Serbian people the magnitude of assistance they could expect after democratization;

(11) recognizes the importance of opposition mayors in Serbia, and encourages the effort of the Administration to include such mayors in the humanitarian and democratization efforts of the United States in Serbia; and

(12) recognizes the progress in democratic and market reform made by Montenegro, which can serve as a model for Serbia, and urges a peaceful resolution of political differences over the abrogation of Montenegro's rights under the federal constitution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be agreed to.

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

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 272), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

## APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h-276k, as amended, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Meeting during the Second Session of the 106th Congress, to be held in Puebla, Mexico, May 5-7, 2000: The Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

## ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2000

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 3. I further ask consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators speaking for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator WELLSTONE, or his designee, 9:30 a.m. to 10:15 a.m.; Senator THOMAS, or his designee, 10:15 a.m. to 11 a.m.

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

Mr. GORTON. I further ask unanimous consent that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 2, under the previous agreement.

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

## PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. For the information of all Senators, on Wednesday there will be a period of morning business until 11 a.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under the previous order, there will be four amendments debated during tomorrow's session, and therefore Senators can expect votes throughout the day. As previously announced, the Senate will not meet on Friday in order to accommodate the Democratic retreat.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORTON. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator SCHUMER.

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

Mr. GORTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

### THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words as we embark on debating ESEA. I hope not to be very long. First, I am glad we are debating this bill, because education is such an important issue to America as we move into the 21st century. We have moved into an economy that is based on ideas. Alan Greenspan put it best. He said that high value is added no longer by moving things—when you make a car with moving things, such as putting in a carburetor here or brakes there—but, rather, by thinking things. All the new technology, such as the Internet, information systems, allow an idea to be transported quickly and inexpensively, which gives ideas so much more power.

In that kind of society, we can't afford to have an educational system that is even second. As we all know, our education system, at least elementary and secondary, isn't even in the top 10. If we want to stay the leading economic power of the world, which I think we all do, we have to make our educational system better.

In the past, the Federal Government has stayed away from education. I argue that there is a national imperative for us to be more involved, not to dictate to the localities what they have to do—that has been a mistake this Government has entered into far too much in the past—but certainly to help and aid in education.

I note that education in America is funded by the property tax, by and large. That is the least popular tax in America, and it puts a real cap on what can be done. Education is done locally, and so there isn't too much ability, when you have thousands and thousands of school districts, to have people think beyond the day-to-day need of providing teaching and other educational services in schools.

The need of the Federal Government to be involved with resources and just as important, if not more important, taking ideas and helping spread them, ideas that have worked in one corner of the country but don't spread to the rest of the country because it is not a capitalistic system—usually we spread ideas because somebody makes money by doing that, but that doesn't happen in public education—is vital.

So when the Federal Government says we should have higher standards, that is a good thing. I believe and I agree with those who believe in higher standards. I don't believe in social promotion. If you are reading at a third-grade level, you should not be in the seventh grade. I agree with my conservative friends in that regard. But I think my more liberal friends are right in that we have to help keep the bar high, and conservatives are right about that, but we ought to help people get

over that bar. If education were completely left up to each locality, that probably would not happen. The bar would not be set high enough and the effort to help people get over the bar might not be forthcoming. So, in my judgment at least, we need more Federal involvement. I think the American people share that judgment. From the data I have seen, that is pretty clear.

Another problem we face is that our system is probably going to be under more stress, not less, in the future. The number of people enrolled is expected to increase by 11 percent. The schools age; the same exact school was in better shape in 1990 than in the year 2000. I have recently visited school districts, fairly affluent ones, on Long Island where the facilities were simply a mess. They had been built during the baby boom in the fifties, sixties, and seventies, and, quite frankly, even those rather affluent districts didn't have the money to fix the schools. They were sort of a mess; they were not great places to look at. Paint was peeling from some of the ceilings.

Most importantly an area I have chosen to focus on, which we will talk a little bit about, is the fact that we are going to have a crisis in teaching. We don't today, but we will in the next 5 or 10 years because so many of our teachers are over 50 years old and they are going to retire. Quite frankly, many of the new teachers who take their place are not up to speed, or at least not of the same quality as the old teachers.

When we have a starting salary of \$26,000, which we do for teachers in America, and the private sector can pay double that, particularly in certain areas such as math and science and technology, we are not going to be getting the best.

In the past, we had captive audiences with cohorts of groups who would teach in the 1930s and 1940s. There were lots of Depression babies. "Go get a civil service job so you will never risk that horrible feeling of being unemployed and unable to provide for your family." In the 1950s and 1960s, women taught; they didn't have other opportunities.

I had so many great teachers when I went through New York public schools.

The last cohort which is now retiring in large numbers is my generation—I am 49—the Vietnam war generation, as you may recall. Young men were given a draft exemption if they taught and hundreds of thousands did. They made very fine teachers. But we don't have those captive audiences, so we have a crisis in having quality teaching.

I will be talking more about that when we do our Democratic amendment. I am happy to have the Inspired Scholarship Program as part of it. We will talk, hopefully, about other amendments that are on this floor, including some of mine which would allow teachers, if they taught for 5 years, to forgo repaying their student loans—we would provide a test in math and science—to give teachers a \$4,000-a-

year stipend so they would continue teaching. We have some true excellence. I will be talking about all of those later.

What I would like to talk about now is just two things, one on this bill. I truly pray that the majority leader will not cut off debate quickly. We have debated education. We debate it only once every 5 years. The last time we did I believe was in 1994—6 years ago. Originally it was 5.

In the area where about 37 percent of Americans consider the most important thing the Federal Government can do, to have a 1- or 2-day debate really doesn't make much sense. It doesn't live up to what this body is about, which is helping people in need.

To say that because we passed Ed-Flex—a nice program but really rather minor in what it does, and only one new State has joined since we passed again the bill last year, or earlier this year—and to say that educational savings accounts, which I believe the President might veto, but even if he does not, don't deal with the hard-core issues of higher standards, better teachers, better classrooms, and smaller class size—to say, having done those two things, that we have done enough and sort of wash our hands of it and walk away would be nothing short of disgraceful. Yet that is the talk.

We should be debating amendments that will make our schools better. There are lots of them. Some of the proposals will pass; many will fail. To have that debate not only helps educate America but it also helps educate each of us. It helps educate one another of us and helps us come to consensus because I believe we will not wait 5 years to do another education bill. I believe within the next 2 or 3 years the crisis, which is looming largely on the horizon now, will be so upon us; whether the new President is AL GORE or George W. Bush, we will be talking about education with frequency. We had better get used to it, and we shouldn't delay that now.

A number of us have gotten together and agreed to do an amendment about school safety dealing with guns. We don't want to have 20, 30, or 40 amendments. There is no attempt whatsoever to delay or bog down this bill. We want to see this bill moved and passed. But school safety is an important issue.

The fact that so many of us believe strongly in gun control and have come together and put together one amendment which will be offered by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG, who has been such a leader on this issue, is no attempt to divert us or to slow this bill down. If we wanted to do that, we would have asked for many amendments.

If the majority leader, in his wisdom, should decide to pull the bill because there is that one amendment, I think most Americans would believe we really do not want to debate education and that it was just an excuse.

The second thing I would like to talk about a little bit is the block grant,