

raise and support Armies. . . .” and “To provide and maintain a Navy.” Since it is possible that we may be facing a lengthy campaign which potentially includes casualties, Senators and Representatives must be prepared to take whatever actions are required to meet this sacred Constitutional directive. Although the Armed Forces have succeeded in meeting this year’s recruiting goals, there are no guarantees that tomorrow’s youth will volunteer to the degree required to maintain the end strength goals of our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.

Like all of you, I pray that we are able to swiftly bring to justice those who perpetrated these heinous crimes of September 11. I hope this can be done without incurring further loss of American lives and that diplomacy and international law will succeed in eliminating the threat of terrorism in the future. Developments around the world following the attacks give us hope that some good may come from this tragedy. For example, in Ireland officials have reported important progress in their negotiations for arms decommissioning. Unfortunately, history illustrates that terrorism has existed for over two thousand years. Certain cowardly groups will inevitably resort to terror against innocent people to compensate for their weakness and attempt to achieve their objectives. Accordingly, the President has rightly turned to our men and women in uniform.

Several years ago, I argued that: “we need to take a hard look to see if it is time to reinstate compulsory national service.” I believed then, as I do now, that the positive benefits to the Nation from compulsory service outweigh any of the conceivable drawbacks. However, the reality is that even today as we face the most serious threat to our Nation since the Second World War, a national draft of some sort is not being actively considered. The military is not eager to return to a conscript force, and others have not recognized the opportunity and value of asking Americans to provide public service as a responsibility of citizenship.

Moreover, some have argued against the practicality of maintaining the Selective Service System at all, claiming that its application is now merely a part of the past. On the contrary, I believe that Selective Service is a national security insurance policy in place for the scenarios we are facing today or may potentially face in the future. If, as the President has said, defeating the evil of international terrorism will require a substantial National effort, the United States must be prepared. In this case, the Selective Service System will be needed as an integral element for assuring our Nation’s Security.

The recent attacks in New York and Washington, DC, and the subsequent anthrax cases have forever changed the way our leaders consider National Security. In response, we must take appropriate actions. I agree with and sup-

port President Bush’s assertion that nothing is to be ruled out of consideration. Furthermore, I believe that operational readiness or response to a major crisis may require the resources of the Selective Service System. For this reason we must make absolutely certain that this organization is at the highest level of readiness and ability. Sadly, this is currently not the case.

Here are the facts. In 1985, the budget for the Selective Service System was \$27.8 million. Today, the budget is \$24.4 million, which in constant dollars equals roughly \$11 million. Today there are 150 fewer civilians and 300 fewer military personnel associated with the Selective Service to carry out its missions. Finally, in 1985, if called upon to respond to a crisis, the Selective Service was capable of delivering personnel in 13 days. Today, we would have to wait 193 days for the first person.

Some believe that 193 days is an acceptable amount of time. They argue that the likelihood of a crisis of significant magnitude to require a draft is simply too remote. Unfortunately, such thinking is naive. Recently, the Senate Armed Service Committee held a hearing to examine the results of an exercise called “Dark Winter.” The exercise, which took place at Andrews Air Force Base in June of this year, simulated a possible United States reaction to the deliberate introduction of smallpox in three states during the winter of 2002. The exercise highlighted a number of potential problems. Foremost among those was that the medical system was quickly overwhelmed and that public health is now a major national security issue.

We now know that bioterrorism is not merely a concept for a war game. The Anthrax cases have highlighted the need to have a rapid and substantial response to medical crisis. In 1987, Congress correctly tasked the Selective Service System to develop a system to draft health care personnel during a crisis. Driving Congressional concerns at that time were the unpredictability of future threats and the availability of weapons of mass destruction, specifically, biological, chemical or nuclear. However, no additional resources have been provided since then and this program remains incomplete. No database exists to quickly mobilize health care practitioners in a crisis. Furthermore, we do not have a validated centralized database of health care skills.

Again, there are those who believe if there were a crisis of the “Dark Winter” type, the existing resources of the Federal government would suffice. This is absolutely not the case. This past February, the head of the Joint Task Force for Civil Support, Major General Bruce Lawlor, expressed concern about the existing military medical system responding to a homeland crisis. Specifically, he pointed out that the Army medical system has been downsized by as much as 40 percent and “what remains is not organized for domestic support.” Further, he cautioned that

the current organization “is not designed to deal with a large number of civilian casualties that could occur in case of a domestic terrorist event. Consequently, he recommended that the active duty military medical system be considered the “last resort.”

I believe the Selective Service System is precisely the right tool to respond to such a crisis. I envision an extremely capable and flexible Selective Service System. A system that can, when called upon, deliver medical personnel for homeland defense in a matter of days and deliver these professionals where they are needed in order to save lives. A truly capable Selective Service System would be able to identify whatever specific skill was required in order to guarantee the security of our Nation and quickly deliver appropriate individuals to where they were needed. Such a system should require more than simply filling out one card at age 18. In order to keep records current and databases useful, one might be required to update information periodically. I am confident that all Americans would be pleased and honored to do this small part for their Country.

Congress would also have to make some difficult decisions. First, women would also have to be considered eligible for the draft. One could not envision a draft of Doctors and Nurses without calling upon the many women who make up the majority of the health care profession. Also, Congressional language prohibits any allocation of resources or implementation of plans for a special skills draft such as I have just described. Finally, an enhanced Selective Service System would clearly require greater funding and manpower.

I have previously asked my colleagues to debate this issue, and now is the time for action. I plan to introduce legislation which will strike those provisions of the law which prohibit the Selective Service System from implementing a special skills draft. Additionally, I have asked the General Accounting Office to conduct a study to determine the costs of a Selective Service System capable of performing the myriad of tasks I envision. Finally, in the next Session of this Congress, I will introduce legislation which will require the registration of all Americans for Selective Service at age 18.

The 21st Century is upon us and we must recognize that all Americans share the responsibility to protect our homeland. I am confident that all Americans are eager to do their part.

DEATH OF SAMUEL L. WOODRING

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I rise today in remembrance of Mr. Samuel L. Woodring, a dedicated member of the community of North Augusta, SC, who passed away Thursday, November 15, 2001, at the age of 75.

Sam Woodring will be remembered as one of North Augusta’s most visible

and spirited citizens. Perhaps best known as the owner and publisher of The STAR newspaper, Mr. Woodring led the weekly newspaper for 45 years and was one of the city's most outspoken commentators. He worked tirelessly to inform the people of North Augusta and to remind the community's public officials that their ultimate responsibility was to the citizens who placed them in office. His work the STAR newspaper earned him great respect within the journalism community of South Carolina and he won numerous awards from the South Carolina Press Association, including the prestigious Elijah Parish Lovejoy Award for Courage in Journalism.

However, the significant contributions Mr. Woodring made during his lifetime are not limited to his role with The STAR newspaper. He also served the people of North Augusta as the president of the Chamber of Commerce, and he was a recipient of the Order of the Palmetto, South Carolina's highest civilian honor. In addition, he served his country with honor and courage in the United States Army during World War II.

In conclusion, Sam Woodring was a man of character and integrity who will be greatly missed by a wide circle of friends. He lived a life of accomplishment and made wonderful contributions to the community of North Augusta. He was a true American and a fine South Carolinian, and my heartfelt thoughts and prayers remain with his family during their time of mourning.

TITLE I TARGETING

AMENDMENT NO. 2058

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Madam President, I am proud to have joined Senators LANDRIEU, COCHRAN, and DEWINE in offering a truly historic amendment, which will for the first time specifically target new title I funding directly to our nation's poorest communities and schools. In doing so, this amendment will help us move closer to realizing the original promise of title I and, more importantly, help us move closer to realizing the promise we have made to give every child in America a high quality education.

The compromise reached today will provide \$1 billion for the targeted grant formula under title I, which was enacted into law by Congress in 1994 but unfortunately has never actually been funded by appropriators. This agreement ensures that no state, or local school district will lose any funds, but at the same time ensures those school districts with the greatest need and with the greatest challenges will receive a significant boost in resources.

For example in my own State of Connecticut, this would mean our three communities with the greatest poverty and educational needs including Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven would receive increases of 25, 35, and 31 percent, respectively, over their cur-

rent funding levels for a combined increase of over \$12.4 million. That is \$12 million more worth of educational services provided and high quality teachers hired to ensure that title I children may achieve academic successes. I would also mean substantial increases in investment for many other communities serving low-income students.

This agreement is by no means perfect. It leaves in place a distribution system that remains badly diluted and seriously inefficient. However, it represents a dramatic change in policy, one that Senator LANDRIEU and I, and the members of the Senate New Democrat Coalition have been fighting for for some time. And we are optimistic that we can build on his breakthrough in the future to really put our education money where our mouth is, and concentrate our resources and our resolve on lifting up our most disadvantaged schools.

Most immediately, this amendment makes a strong statement, acknowledging that title I is just not working as it was intended. The original goal of this critical program was to compensate for local funding inequities within States and help level the playing field for low-income children. But the truth is that this well-intentioned program is not nearly as focused on serving poor communities as it is perceived to be, leaving many poor children without any aid or hope whatsoever.

As my colleagues know, Federal funds for poor children are currently distributed through two grants, basic and concentration. In order to be eligible for basic grants, which comprise the bulk of current title I funds, local districts only need to have 10 school-age children from low-income families, and these children must constitute only 2 percent of the total school-age population. Under the concentration grants, districts with a child poverty rate of 15 percent are eligible to receive funding. As a result of these low threshold, title I funding has been spread too thin and too wide. In fact, according to a 1999 CRS report, title I grants are provided to approximately 90 percent of all local school districts, and 58 percent of all public schools. Even worse, because title I has not been close to fully funded, these diluted formulas have left little aid available for many of the country's poorest students. CRS found that one fifth of all schools with concentrations of poverty between 50 and 75 percent do not receive a dime of title I funding.

In examining these inequities we also cannot ignore the growing impact that concentration of poverty is having on the academic achievement of our nation's school children, particularly those who live in disadvantaged communities. America's top 150 highest poverty cities have 40 percent of our all title I students. Students in these cities face many challenges, none greater than the pervasive poverty that sur-

rounds them. Studies show that, even after controlling for student's socioeconomic background, concentration of poverty has an important negative effect on student achievement.

For example, a U.S. Department of Education study found that "The relationship between family poverty status and student achievement is not as strong as the relationship between school poverty concentrations and school achievement averages." An Urban Institute study of public-housing students in Albuquerque, NM found that, after controlling for home environment, if a poor child lived in a neighborhood and attended school with 20 percent poverty rather than 80 percent poverty, that child's standardized test scores were likely to improve by 13 percentage points.

Concentration of poverty does create a barrier to educational achievement, but that barrier is not impenetrable. University of Tennessee's William Sanders found that high concentrations of poverty do not on their own preclude or prevent schools from raising student achievement. Low-achieving students are often the first to gain, and experience the greatest gains, from quality instruction. Unfortunately, only a small share of our federal resources are getting to the districts most in need of critical funds, which limits the ability of those districts to hire the most qualified instructors and provide the best services.

The Federal Government alone cannot solve this grave inequity. We can only supplement state and local funding, but cannot supplant those resources, and states and localities must do more to target their own resources. A recent Education Trust analysis of funding inequities reveals that school districts with the greatest numbers of poor children have less money to spend per student than districts with the fewest poor children. And a growing body of research shows, according to the Education Trust report, that additional dollars, if directed at the most critical activities, can significantly raise the achievement of poor and minority students.

But the Federal Government can make a real and consequential contribution, both in terms of leadership and of leverage of national resources, and this amendment aims to do both. As I have noted, it will significantly improve the targeting of Federal dollars. But it also includes a second piece that will help reduce the inequities within states. In addition to funding the targeted formula for the first time, this amendment also funds the State finance and incentive grant formula for the first time, a formula intended to reward states that have made real strides in eliminating funding gaps with their own resources.

The amendment calls for channeling \$500 million through this fourth formula, which is commonly known as the "Effort and Equity" formula. Although I share the concerns raised by many