

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period not to extend 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have just consumed calling off the quorum call and proceeding to morning business be charged against the 30 hours postclosure.

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I would like to be recognized to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed for 10 minutes.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the current conference on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as the ESEA. In particular, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that last Friday the conference rejected the Senate's unanimous support for full funding of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA. I am deeply disappointed the conference would reject this very important legislation that has received unanimous support in the Senate.

IDEA has been an extraordinarily important legislative vehicle for students with disabilities throughout this country. Only 15 percent of students with disabilities were receiving any serious education prior to the enactment of IDEA in the mid-seventies. Today a free, excellent public education is the rule of law for all children in America, including those with disabilities.

Today, IDEA serves approximately 6 million children, the majority of whom are taught in regular classrooms in their neighborhoods. They are with their classmates, and they are learning. They are making impressive progress. High school graduation rates for special needs students have also increased dramatically.

In an interesting study between those students who are beneficiaries of IDEA and older adults who did not have this opportunity although they did have disabilities, those younger students with IDEA are in the workforce at a much higher rate. This is not simply a good thing to do in an altruistic sense, it is an important thing to do for our economy, for our workforce.

We have made progress with IDEA. We have increased the number of students who are covered. We have made it a standard that all students, particu-

larly those with disabilities, would have access to classrooms, but we have not lived up to the real promise we made back in the mid-seventies, and that is that we would, in fact, pay 40 percent of the cost of this education for children with disabilities.

Sadly, the Federal share is about 15 percent, leaving it up to the States to make up the difference. As we all know, this has been a constant source of contention between the States and the Federal Government. It is something we have the opportunity to correct in this conference, an opportunity we have not as yet seen, but it is an opportunity I hope in the days ahead we will be able to realize as we return to the conference and, once again, press for full funding of IDEA.

We have been in this body and the other body over the last several years constantly talking about the importance of IDEA, strongly suggesting our unwavering support for IDEA. But those were easy votes because they were simply about the concept.

The hard vote took place last Friday in the conference where we were actually going to put dollars to our words, to match our rhetoric with real resources. Unfortunately, on that real vote, the conference failed.

We have an opportunity to build on what we did in the Senate several months ago. Senator HAGEL and Senator HARKIN offered an amendment that would fully fund IDEA and make it mandatory spending. The amendment would increase in yearly increments of \$2.5 billion until the full 40 percent Federal share is realized by the year 2007.

In the process of making IDEA funding mandatory, it would free up anywhere between \$28 billion and \$52 billion in funds for discretionary educational programs that the Federal Government supports.

This would be a win-win situation, clearly signaling to the States that they can depend upon a robust stream of IDEA funding and at the same time give us the opportunity to support other worthy Federal educational programs such as title I, such as professional development—all those programs that are so important.

The President has rightly made education an important priority in his administration, and he has taken a very aggressive view toward tough accountability standards for testing, but the reality is, without resources, we cannot fully realize the potential of American students. We can test and test and test, but we do not have the resources for professional development, for smaller class size, for better libraries, for a host of programs.

The testing will show us what we know already: There are students who, because of social circumstances, because of income circumstances, because of lack of resources in the schools, are falling behind. We know we can simply divide districts based upon their income, the affluent versus the

poorest, and we will see a startling difference in performance of those children. We want to do better. We want to have tough accountability, but without resources we are not going to get the results.

That, again, is why I am so disappointed we did not follow up with the wisdom of the Harkin-Hagel amendment and in the conference adopt the Senate position: full funding of IDEA, mandatory funding of IDEA. That could be the most fundamental education reform we could ever accomplish this year. Again, we missed the opportunity last Friday, but I hope before this conference concludes we will have another chance to revisit this issue and to seize this opportunity and fully fund IDEA.

Just ask every Governor, every legislative leader, superintendents, principals; they will all say the same thing: The biggest thing we can do to help them provide good education for all students is to fully fund IDEA. That is what I hear when I go back to Rhode Island. I do not hear about more testing. I hear something about libraries and professional development, but what I hear consistently and constantly is: Please, fully fund the IDEA program; please. We are rejecting the pleas of those people who are in the front ranks of education, those people who have the most significant responsibility for education.

Again, I think it is a mistake and a missed opportunity. This issue becomes very real in the lives of the children and the families who deal with issues of disability, and the parents who have to deal with this issue. It is not an academic one. It is not a budgetary issue. It is not an issue that is hypothetical we could debate. It is personal because every parent wants the best for their child. Some parents have to fight constantly to get what is owed their child through the special education program.

In Rhode Island, I constantly meet parents and they contact me. One family, the Gulianos from East Greenwich, RI, wrote to me and told me about their struggle, which is typical of families across this country. From their letter:

Time and time again, we have heard from very well meaning people that there is just not enough personnel or hours available to provide these kinds of services. We are told that they just don't have the funding. Funding that should have come from the legislation that entitles Jamie to receive appropriate educational services in the first place—IDEA.

This school system, one of the best school systems in my State, is not a school system that would do badly on examinations. This is not a school system that lacks professional development or adequate class size or good facilities, but when it comes to IDEA even this district, this affluent community, lacks the resources to fully serve all the children it needs to serve, and this district is a home to families who are themselves typically college educated and very well off, and they can

advocate for their child. But go into a center city where families under more economic stress and sometimes families are with one adult and several children. For these families it is virtually impossible to advocate successfully for the programs as they do in some of the more affluent suburbs. There the crisis is even more severe, the stress of funding more severe. We can alleviate some of those problems and that stress if we go ahead and make IDEA mandatory and free up not only funds for IDEA but also for other educational programs.

I hear the same thing from school principals who say if they get more IDEA funding, they can have additional teachers, enhanced technology, all those things that we say are important to the educational process. Throughout my State, superintendents and principals have consistently and constantly come forward to say, give us more resources for IDEA.

I believe strongly and emphatically this is something we have to do. It is not an option. We cannot put it off until next year or the following year. If we truly want to make an impact on education in the United States today, fund IDEA, provide strict accountability, provide resources for other programs such as professional development and libraries, and we will have educational progress. If we do not do that, then I think all the testing and all the accountability and all the evaluation will simply tell us what we know already: Some students are failing; other students are doing exceptionally well.

The other problem we face is the reality that our brave words about IDEA, and our brave words and authorization about what we want to do with respect to funding education, will shortly collide with reality. Last week, OMB Director Daniels announced we have locked ourselves into several years of deficits, and in those deficits I do not

think we are going to see the commitment in dollars to education we are hearing today in rhetoric. That is another very important reason why today we should make IDEA funding mandatory, and I hope we do.

In my State of Rhode Island, our board of regents for elementary and secondary education has asked for a 4.4-percent increase. Frankly, the Governor is resisting because he has ordered every other department in the State to cut spending 6 percent. That is the reality of the States. If we want educational reform, if we want to assist and support every educational organization in the States, then we have to put real resources into the mix of educational reform.

I argue again that our task in the next several days as we conclude this conference should be to, once again, bring to the conference the issue of IDEA, bring forth the Harkin-Hagel amendment, mandatory funding, a full Federal share by 2007. If we do that, we will have educational reform that works, that is robust, that is well funded, and that will make a huge difference in the lives of every student in America, particularly in the lives of those students with disabilities.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE CONFERENCE REPORT TO H.R. 2299, THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to offer for the RECORD the Budget Com-

mittee's official scoring for the conference report to H.R. 2299, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002.

The conference report provides \$15.3 billion in discretionary budget authority, including \$440 million for defense spending. That budget authority, when coupled with the report's new limitations on obligational authorities, will result in new outlays in 2002 of \$20.076 billion. When outlays from prior-year budget authority and obligation limitations are taken into account, discretionary outlays for the conference report total \$52.744 billion in 2002. Of that total, \$28.489 billion in outlays counts against the allocation for highway spending and \$5.275 billion counts against the allocation for mass transit spending. The remaining \$18.980 billion in outlays, including those for defense spending, counts against the allocation for general purpose spending.

By comparison, the Senate-passed version of the bill provided \$15.575 billion in discretionary budget authority, which, when combined with the bill's obligation limitations, would have resulted in \$52.925 billion in total outlays, or \$181 million more than the conference report. H.R. 2299 is within the subcommittee's Section 302(b) allocations for budget authority and outlays for general purpose, defense, highways, and mass transit spending. It does not include any emergency designations.

I would like to commend Chairwoman MURRAY and Senator SHELBY for their bipartisan efforts in completing this important legislation. I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the budget committee scoring of the conference report to H.R. 2299 be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 2299, CONFERENCE REPORT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002, SPENDING COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

(In millions of dollars)

	General purpose	Defense ¹	Highway	Mass Transit ²	Mandatory	Total
Conference report:						
Budget Authority	14,860	440	0	0	—915	14,385
Outlays	18,568	412	28,489	5,275	801	53,545
Senate 302(b) allocation: ³						
Budget Authority	14,884	695	0	0	—915	14,664
Outlays	19,164	0	28,489	5,275	801	53,729
President's request:						
Budget Authority	14,552	340	0	0	—915	13,977
Outlays	18,543	332	28,489	5,275	801	53,440
House passed:						
Budget authority	14,552	340	0	0	—915	13,977
Outlays	18,500	332	28,489	5,275	801	53,397
Senate-passed:						
Budget Authority	14,880	695	0	0	—915	14,660
Outlays	18,545	616	28,489	5,275	801	53,726
CONFERENCE REPORT COMPARED TO:						
Senate 302(b) allocation: ³						
Budget Authority	—24	—255	0	0	0	—279
Outlays	—184	0	0	0	0	—184
President's request:						
Budget Authority	308	100	0	0	0	408
Outlays	25	80	0	0	0	105
House-passed:						
Budget Authority	308	100	0	0	0	408
Outlays	68	80	0	0	0	148
Senate-passed:						
Budget Authority	—20	—255	0	0	0	—275
Outlays	23	204	0	0	0	—181

¹ The 2002 budget resolution includes a contingent "firewall" in the Senate between defense and nondefense spending. Because the contingent firewall is for budget authority only, the appropriations committee did not provide a separate allocation for defense outlays. This table combines defense and nondefense outlays together as "general purpose" for purposes of comparing the conference report outlays with the Senate subcommittee's allocation.

² Mass transit budget authority is not counted against the appropriations committee's allocation and is therefore excluded from the above numbers.

³ For enforcement purposes, the budget committee compares the conference report to the Senate 302(b) allocation.

Notes.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.