

resources to fulfill these mandates we are about to put on the States, one more time.

The other side is always talking about unfunded mandates. This is going to be another unfunded mandate. Do the testing. Then raise the property taxes to pay for it.

I don't know about other states, but in my State of Iowa we are paying enough property taxes as it is.

Do we have the resources? That is the next question. Right now, of every Federal dollar we spend in discretionary spending of hard-earned tax dollars, 2 cents goes for education. Two cents out of every dollar we spend goes for education.

Again, do we have the resources? It depends on your priorities whether or not we have the resources. Here is the President's tax cut plan. For the wealthiest 1 percent—I am not talking about middle-class tax cuts; I am talking about for the wealthiest 1 percent—\$697 billion in tax cuts to the wealthiest 1 percent; \$21.3 billion for education.

We have the resources. Don't kid yourself. It depends on what you want to do with them. If you want to give it in tax cuts to the wealthiest, you will support the Bush tax cut. If you want to do education, we will have some amendments on the floor when we consider this bill. The real battle will come on appropriations, on whether or not we will have the amount of money in the appropriations bill to pay for all this testing and everything else that we say we love so much.

I remind Senators, a few weeks ago we passed an amendment, 53-47, to take \$250 billion and put it in education over 10 years, compared with the President's request of \$21.3 billion. What we voted on a few weeks ago by a vote of 53-47 will have the resources to pay for the testing. It will have the resources to fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. It will have the resources to fully fund title I programs and the resources to reach down also for things that are not in this bill, such as Head Start.

Second, there are three items that no one is discussing that we will have to belly up to the bar on and vote:

No. 1, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Are we willing to fully fund it or not?

Second, school construction. Are we going to help prepare the leaky roofs and bring schools into the 21st century?

Third, are we going to continue to reduce class sizes so our teachers can teach, so the kids can pass these tests that we are going to foist upon them?

Senator WELLSTONE is right. We need a commitment on resources, not just the rhetoric. When this bill is considered, we will have amendments. But keep in mind the real test is going to come on whether or not the Appropriations Committee will be supported by this administration to come up with the money to fund the rhetoric that we

will hear a lot in the next few days in the Senate.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. Morning business is closed.

BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to S. 1.

Under the previous order, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 23, S. 1, an original bill to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965:

Trent Lott, Jim Jeffords, Bill Frist, Rick Santorum, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Don Nickles, Tim Hutchinson, Strom Thurmond, Frank Murkowski, Pat Roberts, Sam Brownback, Jeff Sessions, Mike Crapo, Judd Gregg, Susan Collins, and Jesse Helms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1, an original bill to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 96, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 88 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Akaka	Chafee	Feingold
Allard	Cleland	Feinstein
Allen	Clinton	Fitzgerald
Baucus	Cochran	Frist
Bayh	Collins	Graham
Bennett	Conrad	Gramm
Biden	Corzine	Grassley
Bingaman	Craig	Gregg
Bond	Crapo	Hagel
Boxer	Daschle	Harkin
Breaux	Dayton	Hatch
Brownback	DeWine	Helms
Bunning	Dodd	Hollings
Burns	Domenici	Hutchinson
Byrd	Dorgan	Hutchison
Campbell	Durbin	Inhofe
Cantwell	Edwards	Inouye
Carnahan	Ensign	Jeffords
Carper	Enzi	Johnson

Kennedy	Murkowski	Smith (NH)
Kerry	Murray	Smith (OR)
Kohl	Nelson (FL)	Snowe
Kyl	Nelson (NE)	Specter
Levin	Nickles	Stabenow
Lieberman	Reid	Stevens
Lincoln	Roberts	Thomas
Lott	Rockefeller	Thompson
Lugar	Santorum	Thurmond
McCain	Sarbanes	Torricelli
McConnell	Schumer	Voivovich
Mikulski	Sessions	Warner
Miller	Shelby	Wyden

NAYS—3

Landrieu	Reed	Wellstone
----------	------	-----------

NOT VOTING—1

Leahy

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 96, the nays are 3. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the caucuses I be allowed to speak at 2:15 for my time, post cloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I believe there are a number of people who want to have the opportunity to speak on this, and we traditionally alternate. I respectfully object.

Objection is heard.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome the fact that we are now going to have a real opportunity for debate on education policy in the Senate. I expect that it will take a number of days in order to address many of the interests of our colleagues, but I think the time could hardly be more well spent. This is the major debate that we will have on a matter that is of central importance to families all over this country. I thank our two leaders for working to make sure that we could have this debate.

As the ranking minority member on the Education Committee, I thank our colleagues from the other side of the aisle, Senator JEFFORDS and others, who have been active and involved in helping to bring us here. I am enormously grateful to all of the members on the full committee who have spent a great deal of time on education matters and have provided leadership in the past in so many different aspects of the education debate.

We are looking forward to this debate. We are looking forward to taking action on education here in the Senate Chamber.

Just to review the bidding, we have filed a cloture motion to proceed to a bill which was reported out of the committee virtually unanimously. However, this vote should not be taken to indicate that a clear consensus has been reached between the administration's best judgment of what is needed and the best judgment of a number of us on how we can really deal with strengthening our educational system. The legislation will be the basis for amendments, although under the rules of the Senate it will be possible, as I understand it, to amend the bill that will be before us, but I expect it is

going to take at least a day before we have real answers.

It is important that our colleagues be given a chance to talk about the areas where this legislation is strong and also the areas where it is weak.

I take this brief time to make a couple of points. First, this legislation is not just about education, it is about the future of our country and the kind of country we are going to have. We know we are talking about the most important quality of our society; that is, for all young people to have a chance for academic achievement and, hopefully, academic excellence. It has been, since the mid-1960s, the priority of this Congress to ensure that the neediest children in our country and to get the special focus, attention, and help that they deserve. It was a national finding in the early 1960s that, despite state efforts in the area of education, we had not really met our responsibility to these needy children.

It has been a long march since that time. There have been many failings in schools along the way. There have been some remarkable successes along the way. There have been some very notable achievements in the more recent years.

We have to look at the fact that even with the investment that has been made by the Federal Government, federal spending on education amounts to about 2 cents out of every federal dollar. We spend close to \$30 billion a year on elementary and secondary education in the K-12 programs. This current bill would only account for \$8 billion of that total. Through current Title I we only reach a third of eligible children. Even if we had all the programs right in this bill, we are still only reaching a third of Title I eligible children.

This has been a long process. We will hear many of those on the other side talk about the failures of our education policy. There are some remarkable changes that have taken place. Fifteen years ago we didn't have the 4.5 million children who have disabilities in our public schools. They were shunted off into state hospitals, into special schools, not really mainstreamed. Today, they are in our public school system attending school alongside their friends and family.

Fifteen years ago, we did not have programs like those in my State today, at Revere High School, a wonderful high school where 43 different languages are being taught. That was not true 20 years ago or 30 years ago. We didn't have the number of single parent families, 20, or 30 years ago, that we have today that puts additional stress on children attending schools. We didn't have the levels of violence that is so prevalent in many of our inner cities where so many of these children live and attend school. We didn't have the levels of substance abuse that we have at the present time. Children are growing up in more complicated and difficult circumstances, and their

teachers are facing much more complicated and difficult circumstances. They need our help.

There are so many dedicated teachers in our inner-city schools who have the opportunity to go to other schools and make a good deal more money. They would most likely have a more modern building, a smaller class size, better access to technology, more professional development opportunities, but they decide to stay. They continue working with challenging situations in the inner-city schools and with the children who so desperately need dedicated, highly-qualified teachers. We must provide these teachers with the educational resources they need, and the professional opportunities they deserve.

This bill can do quite a bit for education in this country, however, it's promise will remain unfulfilled if it is not adequately funded.

We know the importance of investing in children at an early age. We have, over the last 25 years, seen the results of the Carnegie Commission studies and many others that discuss the importance of child development in the early years, the zero to 2 years when brain synapses develop. At that early time their minds begin to develop some ability to learn, an ability that is being awakened as children are being supported and nurtured and given additional kinds of help and assistance.

We know the importance of Early Head Start. We know the importance of Head Start Programs, if they are good Head Start Programs. We are troubled by the fact that we see so many Head Start teachers leaving. There has been a serious decline in their incomes. Even though their incomes are \$8 or \$9 or \$10,000 a year, their purchasing power has deteriorated as we have failed to have any increase in the minimum wage. We see children now in the Head Start Programs that have two or three teachers in the space of one year. They are not able to develop the kind of ongoing relationship with a caring adult that they need at that stage of their life. We are not providing sufficient support to these programs.

When we talk about education in this bill, Democrats on this side and many of our Republican friends on the other side know that this is only one part of the whole education puzzle. It is important that we get it right. But it is also important, if we are really interested in strengthening our education system, that we come back and revisit the priorities of the Early Head Start Programs, the early interventions, the Head Start Programs, adequate funding, the child care programs, all the kinds of outreaches that impact these children along the pathway as they come to school.

When we talk about leaving no child behind, at a composite of different times during the children's development, we have to make sure, to the extent that we can, through policy and through priorities, to reach out to

those children. We understand, all of us, that the first way the children learn is through their parents and their families—we understand that—and by working through their faiths and other support programs. But to the extent we can impact it, we ought to make sure we get the policy right, but also that we are going to make sure no child is going to be left behind.

That brings me to my third point, and that is the issue of resources.

I welcome the opportunity, unlike last year when, quite frankly, with all respect, there was more of an effort to deny President Clinton a win on the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act than there really was a serious effort to pass a decent bill. But that is in the past. What we have been trying to do is to respond to the President's invitation to work with him on what he considers to be the No. 1 priority.

For us, it is the No. 1 priority. For the parents and the children, it is the No. 1 priority. But we believe strongly—I do, and I know others of our colleagues do—if it is going to be the No. 1 priority, it has to be the No. 1 priority in terms of resources. That is not where this legislation is headed. We have seen the request of the budget for \$659 million, when we are talking about 7 million children who are left out. Their increase is \$659 million. That just is not going to respond. The President has indicated they are prepared to do somewhat more. We said at the start of this debate, we cover a third of the children at the present time.

Title I funding should cover all children. No child should be left behind when it comes to providing funds for students who most need educational resources. We hope that by the end of the first term of the Bush Presidency the Title I program will cover all eligible children.

We need full funding for the title I program to make sure that no child will be left behind in this program. We are going to then come back on these other programs as well, to the Head Start Programs, and early intervention programs. We are also going to have an important debate on funding of the IDEA for the education of children with special needs. There are cross currents of children who need special kinds of help and attention who are included in that program. Some of the children are, obviously, the same who need additional help in reading and other programs.

We will have the chance at the end of this debate to find out who is truly committed to leaving no child behind because that is going to take resources. We heard a bit of the debate yesterday which tried to make the case that Democrats simply want to spend more money. Money, say some, is not the answer to our problems in education. But reform, without the necessary resources, is not reform—it is a formula for failure.

If a child doesn't learn algebra in the eighth grade, they are less likely to go

on to college. Eighty percent of the children in the inner cities do not have a math teacher who can teach algebra. That is a fact today. We know that. But you cannot bridge the gap between our poorest and wealthiest schools, without providing them the resources to train their teachers and to hire new, fully qualified teachers. Only with these resources will more of our students in the inner cities have a better chance of taking classes like algebra and a better chance of going on to college.

We know the problems we are facing in reading today. We know what it takes to catch up. We heard discussions about the Sylvan Learning Centers. Will they be permitted to provide tutorial services? Yes, they will be. We will use those, even though they are for-profit.

Sylvan says they need 36 hours to work with a child to bring that child up 1 year in reading achievement. But the average child spends 50 hours over the course of a year. That would cost \$1,900 per child. We cannot say we are for reading and then fail to provide the necessary investment to improve the performance of our nation's students in reading.

But today many of our children aren't reading. We know many children aren't reading and we know what it takes to get them reading. It is going to mean an investment: an investment in our neediest students so that their schools can work effectively to improve their performance in reading; an investment in training for our teachers in the latest methods of teaching reading; an investment in providing educational opportunities after school.

It also means an investment to make sure that we have the best tests that will fairly and accurately assess students. Investment is necessary to ensure that we will test a child's ability to reason, rationalize and distinguish. We have seen those developed in a number of our States. The MCAS test in Massachusetts is this sort of a test.

We need to make a lot of progress. But we are not for a quick, slick, easy examination. We want to make sure we are going to have thoughtful teachers. We want to make sure the teachers are going to be quality teachers for our children. We want to make sure the schools are going to be quality schools to the extent that we can help and assist them.

We know we have 10,000 failing schools today. That is the last projection. We know that the average cost to bring those schools along and turn them around is \$180,000. There is a whole series of different ways they can be turned around that have been tested and examined. There are 57 proven, research-based comprehensive reform models that have been identified by the New American Schools Development Corporation, a creation of the first Bush Administration. These models, including Success for All and Reading Recovery among others, cost an aver-

age of \$180,000. That would cost a total of \$1.8 billion to turn around all 10,000 failing schools.

If you are going to turn around schools, you are going to have to invest. Currently the Department of Education is able to fund less than 20 percent of after-school grant applications. There are 7 million latch key children nationwide. In the first hour after school lets out, the juvenile crime rate triples. If we are going to use the after-school programs to help strengthen and tutor the children, we are going to have to invest. We are going to have to invest in our children.

So what are we asking? Is this something that just the Democrats are asking for or speaking for? Absolutely not. Later, when we get into the real debate, I will put in the RECORD what the National Governors have said in terms of funding for this program. I will put into the RECORD what 38 organizations that have represented children and parents and schools have said in terms of the full funding of this program. I will put into the RECORD what the League of Cities, who have a direct insight into what is happening in the inner cities, say in terms of full funding. They say if you are going to do the job right, you need to have the resources. That is what we are saying at the outset of this debate. We have to have the resources to be able to do the job, or we are failing these children and failing them in a very important way.

That is why this debate is so important, because it is about the future. We know that as we move into a global society and economy, that only about 20 percent of the new entrants into the job market have the skills which 60 percent of them need at the present time. We are not giving them the kind of training they need. We are lagging in education and in investing in people and training. The Republicans act as if the tax cut is an economic program—it is not. It is not. We need to invest in the quality of education, which is basic and fundamental in a democracy. We have to invest in terms of the training, and we have to ask this Nation what its priorities are. Should we trade in a small fraction of a \$1.6 billion tax cut to invest approximately \$5 billion a year in title I to cover every child by the end of FY 05?

We are going to be asked, according to the Wall Street Journal in a recent report, to increase our budget \$25 to \$30 billion a year for defense. That is going to pass in this body. Are we saying that we are unwilling to provide approximately 5 billion a year for the next 4 years to get to full funding for Title I? Are we saying that we are unwilling to provide the additional resources for afterschool programs, or professional training, or for libraries or smaller class sizes? We are saying we are going to spend the \$25 billion a year. You can expect that for the next 6 to 8 years, but we are not going to give you the \$5.5 billion.

This is about priorities. I guess we can't do that. That \$1.6 trillion tax cut

is too sacred to say we are going to reduce that a little in order to fund this program. We think it should be reduced. We believe the American people believe so, too. We are going to give the opportunity to this body to express itself on that issue. We are going to give them the opportunity to do so today, tomorrow, every single day that we debate this. Then we are going to have the opportunity to vote on it every time we are going to face the budget when it comes back from conference and every time in appropriations.

So get used to it because we are going to give this institution the opportunity to vote and vote and vote about whether they are going to put the children as the first priority. We guarantee it. That is going to be it. Hopefully, if we are able to get that kind of commitment, we can move along and join hands together and say we have a bill that is worthy of the children of this country. But it is not there yet.

I see others who want to speak. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first of all, I commend my colleague from Massachusetts for his eloquence and his passion about a subject matter to which he has dedicated a substantial part of his public service—the plight and condition of America's children under a variety of adverse circumstances. His passion and concern about the condition of our public education system at the elementary and secondary level has, once again, been expressed in the most heartfelt of terms and views, which I am hopeful and confident express the views of a majority of Members of this body regardless of party or ideology.

I am very confident I express the views of the majority of American citizens who, without knowing the details, understand intuitively that if this Nation is going to live up to its potential, to its own aspirations as expressed more than two centuries ago by the founding members of this Nation's Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, that we need to have the best quality of education this country can provide, particularly to a generation that will face challenges unimaginable by even this generation, not to mention generations past.

This is a critical debate. It doesn't get any more important than this. I have often said if you get the educational needs of this country right, you may not have an absolute formula to address every other concern, but an educated population, an educated America, is in a far stronger position to resolve the great issues of their day than an ignorant population. An ignorant nation, an ignorant democracy is a dangerous country, in the sense that people don't understand or grasp the subtle nuances of our Constitution, of

our Declaration of Independence, of our Bill of Rights, not to mention their ability to provide for themselves and to add to the greater prosperity of our Nation.

This is the No. 1 priority. The President has this right. This is and ought to be the No. 1 issue we grapple with as a country. There is no more important issue than the quality of our public elementary and public secondary schools in America.

This morning, roughly 55 million children went to an elementary school or a secondary school in America. Of that 55 million, 50 million went off to a public school; 5 million went off to a private or parochial school. Certainly, while we do things we can to support and assist those private and parochial schools, our fundamental obligation is to public education. It has been since the founding days of this country, in one manner or another.

On the first great debate on education in the 21st century, a debate that will determine over the next 7 years what our priorities are when it comes to public elementary and secondary education, it is important we try and find as much support and common ground for investing in the neediest schools in this country. That has been our Federal obligation.

I make the case we need to change the formulation of how we fund public education in the country. I think this idea of depending upon a property tax in State after State, community after community, may have served the country well in the 19th century, and even for a good part of the 20th century, but the idea today that the primary source of educating the 50 million young people who went off to school today ought to be based on the property taxes of local communities, as is the case in most States in this country, is an archaic, backward idea.

We need to be a far better partner. We only provide a small percentage; 6 cents of every dollar spent on elementary and secondary education comes from the Federal Government; 94 cents, 95 cents comes from our local communities and some from the States. It is mostly from local communities.

I would love to see at some point becoming a one-third partner: One-third of the resources provided by the Federal Government, one-third by States, and one-third by local communities. What a great relief it would be to lower property taxes across this country, to be able to have the Federal Government contribute a far greater percentage of the educational needs of America's children and their families. That debate will not occur this week. We are going to argue about the 6 or 7 cents and how those 6 and 7 cents are going to be spent.

Let's be clear at the outset; we are a very minor participant. The Federal Government is a minor participant in the financial costs of public education in this country. How we spend those 6 cents will be the subject of this debate

which may consume as many as 2 or 3 weeks of the Senate's time.

What do you do with 6 cents? Historically, over the past 25 or 30 years, we have said our obligation will be to serve the most endangered, the most needy students in schools in the country. We have done that in title I, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, in a variety of other proposals, but principally it has been to serve the neediest kids and the neediest schools in America in both rural, urban areas, and suburban areas.

Over the next 2 or 3 weeks, we will talk about how to better target those resources and how to get some improved accountability so when dollars are being spent there is some assurance coming back that kids are learning and teachers are teaching. So we will have a good discussion about how to improve accountability, how to improve some sort of grading system without overburdening school districts.

We speak in a rather lofty tone when it comes to demanding testing. I don't think anyone wants to be part of a formulation that demands testing without providing the resources to the schools to see it gets done, and also adding to the burdens of teachers and school districts and parents by having nothing more than testing going on.

Someone said in my State the other day, taking someone's temperature three or four times a day does not make a child better. It does not improve their health. It tells you how they are doing. Testing three or four times a year, whether a local test, a State test, or a Federal test, doesn't make that student a better student with more knowledge. It merely tells you how they are doing. There are many who are concerned that demanding more testing will turn the schools into nothing more than test prep centers where kids are geared every day and every week to pass a test, to get good scores on the tests, and where actual learning takes a secondary position.

While I understand the value of testing, let's not get carried away and set up a system that we come back with 4 or 5 years from now and all we have done is fulfill a self-fulfilling prophecy; that kids in poor districts don't do very well. We know that already. You can spend all the time and effort possible to test people. But for the life of me, I don't understand all the value of that, at the expense of trying to do things that would actually improve the conditions so kids do better on the tests we do provide.

Many feel there are things we can do with the 6 cents. Remember, I am talking 6 cents—not 100 cents on the dollar but 6 cents. That is all we give now. That is what Uncle Sam sends, 6 cents on every dollar.

It seems to me we ought to improve the structures where kids attend school. We know a child who walks into a building that is 50, 60, or 70 years old and falling apart isn't going to

learn very well. I don't need a study by a bunch of Ph.D.'s at the Department of Education over the next 6 years to tell me that. Talk to any parent who takes their kid to a school that leaks, that is not wired, that is falling apart, and I will guarantee that child in those circumstances is not going to learn very well.

Put some of these resources in to see to it that the buildings, these structures, these physical plants, might be improved so that child who arrives at that school building has a better chance to learn. About 50 percent of all the kids who went to school this morning entered a building built more than 50 years ago—50 percent. I think the need for improving the physical structure is quite obvious in the urban and rural areas that are the most impoverished and the poorest.

Reducing class size, again, I don't think it has great value in having studies done over the next 5 or 6 years. Any parent will tell you, a child will tell you, if they are in a classroom with 20 or 25 students and one teacher, the teacher cannot teach and the kids can't learn. This is not brain surgery. This is about as basic as it can get.

I spoke to a group of charter school students from Connecticut the other day on the east front of the Capitol. I said: Tell me why you like the charter school.

They said: We get more attention.

I said: Why do you get more attention?

Because the classes are smaller.

These were not the teachers talking or the parents. These were the kids. We are doing more in charter schools, and that is good news, but not every child gets to go to a charter school.

I asked: How did you get to go to a charter school?

It was a lottery. We put our names in a hat and they drew out so many names. There were hundreds who wanted to go, but it was a lottery. They picked them out of the hat, so these kids from this town of mine in my State of Connecticut got to go.

I applaud what they are doing with the charter schools. I think they are great ideas. But we cannot just talk about improving charter schools at the expense of these other public schools. If it is good for a charter school, why can't it be good for the other schools as well? Why can't every school be a charter school in America? Are we so inept that we cannot come up with the means by which every kid who goes to school, as they did this morning, could walk into a classroom where they were not one of two dozen students vying for the attention of a teacher in order to learn? We know without any question that in a class that is smaller, where a teacher has the opportunity to really spend some time with these children, you can make a difference in the quality of their education and how they will do on those tests that we all seem so interested in funding or requiring as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Regarding afterschool programs, how many days do parents worry about where their children are? Single parents working, two-income parents, parents who stay at home, wondering where that child is, what goes on after 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Talk to any police chief. I wonder if you think I am making these things up. Call your local police department if you question my veracity on this and ask the local police chief what is the most dangerous time of day for young kids, in terms of them being victims or creating problems themselves. They will tell you it is not after 7 or 8 or 10 o'clock at night. The most dangerous time is between 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. Again, that is the conclusion of every police chief I ever talked to across the country.

So afterschool programs become critically important, not just to keep kids safe but as part of the learning experience. We think with that 6 cents I talked about here, we ought to allocate some of those resources to expand afterschool programs because we know they work. In this day and age, we should be utilizing our school buildings after school, weekends, evenings, summers, so these learning centers become more a part of our community, assisting the towns and counties and States. That is where kids can channel their energies into constructive alternatives. Left alone, we know all too often what happens. Good kids can make bad decisions, decisions that affect them the rest of their lives.

There are many of us, as we begin this debate, who would like to see some effort made to improve the physical structures where kids go to school every day, reducing those class sizes so the kids have an opportunity to really learn, seeing to it there are afterschool programs, making sure we have full funding for title I so these needy students and their families across the country will get the support they richly deserve.

My hope is that at long last we will be able to pass some mandatory funding for special ed. How many towns across the country have told us the costs of special education are depriving them of the resources other children need in their communities? I know that will be offered.

My colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, and I will offer an amendment on title I for full funding. I know my colleague, the Presiding Officer, sat through the debate and discussion in our committee, the HELP Committee, and I know he is sympathetic to the full funding of title I. If we come up with that as part of the formula for funding this authorization bill, we would like to have his support on this as well, knowing he was part of the debate during committee consideration.

But I hope we can come up with a mechanism for full funding of title I and for special education, to see to it we live up to our obligations and fulfill the commitments we must make.

Again, going back to what I said at the outset of these remarks, there is no

more important issue to address as a legislative body, as a national legislative body. It is not enough any longer that I only have to worry about how a child is doing in Connecticut, how a young student is doing in Bridgeport or Hartford or Sterling or Union or my hometown of East Haddam, CT, but how kids are doing in California, how they are doing in Illinois, how they are doing in Florida and Michigan and Maine. These are national issues now.

If a kid fails in Wyoming, then that is a problem for those of us who live in Connecticut, just as it is a problem for those who live in Wyoming if a kid in Connecticut is not doing well. Children in the 21st century will compete with children in Beijing, in Moscow, in Sidney, Australia, in Tokyo. All across the world is from where the global competition comes. So we have to do what we can with that 6 cents we contribute to elementary and secondary education to see to it that those dollars are going to reach those families and those communities that have the greatest need.

I wish it were otherwise. I wish we were talking about picking up a third of that responsibility, as I think any national government ought to do in the 21st century, and contributing to the quality of our overall educational system. Unfortunately, that is not part of this bill. But I think that in getting these dollars up on title I and special ed, contributing to school construction and class size and afterschool programs, our dollar is well invested.

Let me mention last of all the issue of funding, because you are going to hear a lot of debate about what we can afford and not afford to do. Later today, if he has not done it already, the President of the United States is going to call for \$60 billion on a national missile defense system. I happen to believe in the 21st century we are going to have to develop some form of a missile defense system. I will not take a back seat to anybody in my commitment to seeing to it that the national security needs of my country are met. But we are going to be asked today, without knowing much more about it, to spend \$60 billion. Senator KENNEDY mentioned \$25 or \$30 billion increases each year in the coming few years.

I think there may be a good case to be made for increasing spending for the national security needs of this country and for developing a national missile defense system. I understand the need for that. But I want it to be done in a way that is going to reflect what we can achieve, the kind of science that needs to be developed, done in coordination, my hope would be, with our allies so this is a shared technology that will protect us from potential hazards we face with this ever-modernizing technology that puts us all at risk.

We have been asked to support a \$1.6 trillion tax cut. What we are talking about here is modest increases for the educational needs of America. If it is important to invest dollars to protect

the national security needs, if it is important to invest dollars for the economic security of a country, how can you really talk about being secure militarily or economically if you do not have an educated population? If you do not have an educated population, how secure are you? If you have kids growing up where the gap grows wider and wider and wider every single year between those who fit into an economy where they understand and have the tools necessary to perform and those who do not and are left further and further and further behind. They then beget children of their own who get further and further behind. You end up having a growing segment of your population that really cannot fit into a modern economy or understand or contribute to the national security of a nation.

This is a seamless garment. National security or economic security are never going to be secured if you do not have an educated nation. That means every child being given the opportunity to reach his or her potential.

None of us has an obligation to guarantee success. I feel no burden whatsoever to say to any child in America: I have an obligation to see to it you succeed. I do not have that burden.

But I feel the burden that every child ought to be given the opportunity to succeed regardless of economic circumstances, of race, of ethnicity, or geographical location. A child should not be left behind because of the action in Washington, because of the town they are born in, or the economic circumstances of their parents. That is not my America. My America says every child should have the chance to reach his or her potential to contribute to their own well-being and to contribute to the well-being of this Nation. That is what successive previous generations have done. That is why this country has achieved the success it has.

If we are going to continue that legacy in the 21st century, it becomes the collective responsibility of the 100 of us in this Chamber, the national legislature, with the 6 cents we get to manipulate in terms of the educational needs of a nation, to see to it that the neediest of our citizens are going to have an opportunity to achieve America's dream. You cannot do that without an education. You may get lucky at a casino or you may hit the lottery one day. But that is not how most Americans need to depend upon their economic future and to fulfill their dreams. You cannot succeed in America without a good education. To do otherwise is totally a fiction.

This debate over the next few weeks is about as important as it gets. This debate over the next few weeks is on whether or not we will have the intestinal fortitude to commit the modest resources to seeing to it that America's schools and America's children are going to get the best they can from their Federal Government under these circumstances.

Again, I wish to reiterate that we were a far better partner. I think it ought to be a source of collective embarrassment that the Federal Government contributes only 6 cents out of every dollar in America in the 21st century. Why we cannot be a one-third partner, to me, is beyond imagination. Yet that is where we are.

The 6 cents that we will be talking about contributing will make a difference. My hope is that we will fully fund those 6 cents to see to it that these schools, children, and families will have the chance to maximize their potential.

There will be extensive debate. I will be talking about the various issues that come along. I look forward to the amendment that I will offer with my colleague and friend from Maine, Senator COLLINS, on title I. I look forward to the debate on special education and these other issues that come along. I will have an amendment with my colleague from Alabama on privacy issues that we will be offering along with some other suggestions with my friend from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, on charter education.

We will have a good debate and a good discussion on some of these issues. My hope is at the end of this debate we will be able to meet as a body and say to each other that we have done the right thing for our country. Many of us may not be here when the next education bill comes to the floor. I would like to think that on this occasion and during this discussion we are mindful that this may be our last opportunity individually to leave our signature on how we would like to see America meet its educational challenges for the 21st century.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his remarks. They are right on. I wish to associate myself with them. I wish to thank him for his decades of perseverance on behalf of education. It was an excellent set of remarks. I thank him very much.

Mr. President, my understanding is that each Member has an hour to speak on the motion to proceed. I intend to use my time not only on the education bill, but because of the situation in California with respect to energy, I wish to give this body, on the 1-year anniversary of the energy crisis, a brief report. I ask unanimous consent to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator realize that we have a 12:30 recess for the policy conferences?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I do. I will use the 15 minutes, if I may.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much.

THE ENERGY CRISIS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak once again about

the California energy crisis. Today is the first day of May and in many parts of California, it is the start of a 5-month summer and the start of a five-month period of the highest electricity demand. The day also marks the 12th consecutive month we have been in an energy crisis—I add to that the Pacific Northwest—meaning for an entire year we have experienced energy prices that are about 10 times higher than they were in the previous 12 month period. And it also marks the 12th consecutive month that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has failed to take decisive action.

It took the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission until November to declare what people in San Diego, California discovered last May, electricity rates are “unjust and unreasonable” and the market is broken.

Last week, FERC attempted to modify the broken market with so-called “price mitigation.” In its April 26th order, the FERC outlined its proposal “to mitigate the dysfunctional market.” Unfortunately, what FERC offered as a solution will not do nearly enough to solve the problems in California and the Northwest.

First, the order for the most part, ignored the Northwest—offering only a limited investigation of the broken market in Oregon and Washington without any promise of even the feeble price mitigation offered to California.

Second, the order will last only one year, not nearly enough to get enough supply on line to meet our energy needs.

Third, the order only applies to stage 1, 2, and 3 energy emergencies, practically ensuring that prices for the rest of the time can remain exorbitantly high.

Fourth, the FERC order decreed that the cost based rate of the price for the least efficient megawatt of power needed at any given hour would go to everyone who bid into the market. With natural gas prices still averaging three times higher in California than elsewhere, it is almost a guarantee that this would mean at many hours, the average price of electricity will be \$400-\$500 per megawatt.

Which brings up the most glaring problem with the FERC order: It does not address natural gas, which is the major cost in electricity production and a problem in itself for heating, cooking, food and manufacturing production, etc. I would like to take this opportunity to read from some letters I have received about the energy crisis.

Let me speak about a letter from the California Steel Industries, and I quote:

Our company is a relatively large consumer of both electricity and natural gas. Our historical gas bill was about \$12 million annually. With the price gouging going on in California, that bill will rise to \$40 million or even \$50 million this year. For electricity, we historically paid about \$15 million per year. That number will double this year due to increased retail rates, which became necessary as a result of skyrocketing wholesale prices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

CALIFORNIA STEEL INDUSTRIES, INC.,
Fontana, CA, April 16, 2001.

Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FEINSTEIN: This is to ask for your help in immediately seeking emergency action by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, to stop the relentless profiteering and price gouging by energy providers to the state of California.

The problem in the wholesale price of electricity is well documented. Power prices have gone from about \$30 per megawatt hour in 1999 winter months to more than \$1400 per megawatt hour at times during the winter of 2000-01. This was not due to a rise in demand or a supply shortage—the winter months for both years saw demand at about half of the summer peak period.

High prices have continued through the moderate spring weather and could hit astronomical levels this summer.

Natural gas, a key component of electricity generation and of industrial production in its own right, has followed suit. While the price of natural gas is up across the nation—about double the historical average in Chicago, New York and Texas, for example—in California, it is about six times the historical average. In recent weeks, natural gas has been a little over \$5 per MMBTU in most areas of the country, and nearly \$15 in South California.

Our company is a relatively large consumer of both electricity and natural gas. Our historical gas bill was about \$12 million annually. With the price gouging going on in California, that bill will rise to \$40 million or even \$50 million this year. For electricity, we historically paid about \$15 million per year. That number will double this year due to increased retail rates, which became necessary as a result of skyrocketing wholesale prices.

For California Steel Industries and its 1,000 direct employees, those numbers are not only mind-boggling, they spell disaster. No business can absorb that kind of a hit for long and continue to survive. We are the largest producer of flat-rolled steel in Southern California, and we serve nearly 400 customers, most of whom are in California. We cannot pass along these increased costs to our customers because they can easily purchase competing steel from the Midwest, the East, and from offshore, produced with far less expensive energy.

Unfortunately, our story is just one of many in California these days.

The President of the California Public Utilities Commission, Ms. Loretta Lynch, has requested the help of the FERC in this crisis. Thus far, she has been rebuked by the regulators, on the basis that this is simply a supply and demand issue that will straighten out as soon as more power plants are built and more gas pipelines constructed. Unfortunately, we fear the problem will go away even sooner—by a huge drop-off in demand as businesses shut down and lay people off. This is not the solution the FERC wants, we are sure. However, we cannot wait for the FERC's theoretical approach to solve everything 50 months from now. We cannot even wait 50 days.

It is our belief that there is *no fair market* for gas or electricity in California, and there will not be fair pricing without federal intervention at the wholesale price level. We are committed to doing our part for conservation. We would also welcome the chance to talk with you personally about this subject.