

increase funding for education over what is in the baseline by \$150 billion. I supported that. But we have an incredible disconnect going on between what we are doing on the floor of the Senate and what we are about to do in the budget resolution. The budget resolution that has come out of the conference committee has no new money for education—none, zero. So we are all out here talking about education being the top priority—and, indeed, it is—but we have a budget resolution coming out of the conference committee that gives no priority to education—none, not one thin dime of additional resources to education. It is really an incredible disconnect—the difference between the rhetoric on the floor and the reality of this budget resolution.

The new President of the United States proposed a very modest increase in education over the so-called baseline. He proposed \$13 billion of new money for education over the 10-year period. In the Democratic alternative budget, we proposed \$139 billion of new money for education over the 10-year period. What passed on the floor of the Senate when we considered the budget resolution was an increase of \$308 billion. We passed the Harkin amendment, which reduced the tax cut by \$450 billion and allocated half to education and half to debt reduction. The Harkin amendment added \$225 billion to education over the next 10 years. It went to conference committee to be worked out as to the differences between the House and Senate, and they came back with nothing, zero, no new money.

We passed on the floor of the Senate the Jeffords-Breaux amendment which added \$70 billion to fund IDEA. That went to the conference committee and came back with zero—a big nothing. So there is no new money in this budget for education, and our colleagues ought to be aware of it as we consider the budget next week.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1) to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 372 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) proposes an amendment numbered 372.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment reads as follows:

(Purpose: To tie funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improved student performance)

On page 29, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

***SEC. 16. FUNDING RULE.**

“(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

“(1) Adjusted for inflation, the amount of money Federal, State, and local governments spend per public school student has nearly doubled over the past 30 years.

“(2) This doubling of real, per-pupil spending has had no effect on test scores.

“(3) In 1965, the Federal Government enacted title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to eradicate the achievement gap between economically disadvantaged students and their more advantaged peers.

“(4) In 2001 that achievement gap persists, unaffected by the \$120,000,000,000 the Federal Government has spent on such title I.

“(5) In 1996 the Department of Education reported that ‘The progress of [part A of title I] participants on standardized tests and on criterion-referenced tests was no better than that of nonparticipants with similar backgrounds and prior achievement’.

“(b) FUNDING RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a State shall be eligible for an increase in the amount of funds made available under this Act from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year (after adjusting for increases in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) when the State meets the requirements for adequate yearly progress for the State under section 1111(b)(2) for the school year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made, except that nothing in this subsection shall be construed to provide funds to a State under this Act for any fiscal year in an amount that is less than the amount of funds provided to the State under this Act for fiscal year 2001.”.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to address the very issue my colleague has just talked about, the issue of spending and education. We have offered an amendment to curb the Federal Government’s appetite to spend tax dollars. It will ensure that we no longer throw good money after bad programs. It will focus our Nation’s educational bureaucracy on what should be its sole purpose: helping students learn.

Over the course of the last several days, we have been debating reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA, and in that process we are adding by authorization a phenomenal amount of new money for the purpose of education.

We have heard a great deal in this Chamber about how much we need to spend to improve education for our young people. Every Senator clearly wants to improve the educational system to which we entrust our children’s futures. Unlike the past, we are offering some very real reforms this time. But in a continuation of past practices,

we also are offering a tremendous amount of new money.

Let me say very clearly that we have spent an awful lot of money on education in the past, and the record is very clear that money alone does not solve that problem. In fact, the additional money we have added to our educational system over the last 30 years has done nothing to improve education.

Over the past 30 years, the amount of money we have spent to educate our children has doubled; that is even after inflation. In other words, it is real money we’re talking about here and a lot of it. It will cost taxpayers twice as much to educate my grandchildren in public schools as it did to educate my children in public schools.

We doubled the amount we spend on each student in the timespan of 30 years. Yet this huge increase in spending has brought us, as I just mentioned, nothing.

This is a chart that demonstrates that clearly. In spite of the fact that per-student spending has doubled and continues to climb, student achievement has stagnated. This is a line that demonstrates that major increase in spending over the timeframe I have mentioned through the seventies, the eighties, and the nineties. Look at the reading scores of the national assessment of 17-year-olds, 13-year-olds, and 9-year-olds. Somehow it does not seem to parallel the amount of money we have spent.

We doubled the resources, and yet somehow the system did not improve, and our children were shortchanged. Today’s schoolchildren are entering an educational system that is no better than that in which their parents were educated. In fact, there are measurements to indicate it is worse.

This next chart shows that not only have reading scores stagnated over that 30-year period, but doubling education spending likewise has brought us no improvement in math and no improvement in science. Yet our young people, in a very integrated world where demand for math and science skills is higher than ever, must compete with students from around the world for jobs that in their very character are international. Yet our educational system, despite all the money we’ve poured into it, has produced stagnation in math and science achievement for the last 30 years.

The law we concern ourselves with today was passed in 1965. Its primary purpose is to close the achievement gap between poor students and nonpoor students. Since 1965, we have devoted some \$120 billion to this goal. Yet as this chart demonstrates, \$120 billion later, poor kids still lag behind in reading. In other words, poor kids are no better off today than they were 30 years ago. We have achieved nothing for them. Most important, we have allowed them not to achieve, and the taxpayers of this country have spent \$120 billion in a failed attempt to close that gap.

Five years ago, the Department of Education conducted a review of this program for disadvantaged students known as title I and found:

The progress of [title I, part A] participants on standardized tests and on criterion-referenced tests was no better than that of nonparticipants with similar backgrounds and prior achievement.

When tested, no difference could be found between those inside title I and those outside title I. I want to repeat that. The progress of the participants was no better inside the program than outside the program. In other words, we spent a lot of money on a program that did nothing to improve the situation of these poor children. One hundred twenty billion dollars and nothing to show for it.

How did we reward the system's failure? Of course, with more money. We allowed the establishment to design the system, and we fed the system money hoping that young people would improve, hoping that their scores in reading, math, and science would improve, and it did not happen.

Yes, children have been left behind for a good number of years. We have struggled mightily. Certainly the chairman and the Presiding Officer have struggled mightily to try to reform the primary and secondary education systems of our country. The establishment has fought them openly and aggressively.

Today we have some reform, but we are also putting in a phenomenal amount of new money through authorization with that reform. The question is, What will it yield?

It has been said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and just hoping there will be a different result. That is exactly what we have been doing for 30 years.

This is a prescription for mediocrity.

The amendment I offer today will change the way the Federal Government deals with schools that fail to improve. It is a moderate amendment and, I believe, a compassionate amendment.

Decade after decade, as I have demonstrated, at least for the last three decades, schools have failed to improve, and decade after decade, with a wink and a smile, we tell the system: Don't worry about how many children you have left behind, we are still going to give you more money.

The amendment I offer today will stop handing out rewards for leaving children behind. Under this amendment, in order to receive a funding increase under this act, States would be required to make adequate yearly progress in boosting student achievement, as defined in the bipartisan agreement reached between my colleagues from Vermont and Massachusetts, the chairman of the committee and the ranking member.

This is a moderate measure. It will not cut educational spending. It guarantees that a State's funding level cannot fall below its current level but that

a State that does not improve their children's achievement would forgo any reward from the Federal Government until they do.

This amendment even allows the act to adjust for inflation because if we did not, that would be a real cut.

What we have to say to the educational establishment of this country is: If you do not create a system that allows our children to achieve at ever improving rates, then we cannot reward you with more of the taxpayers' money.

Public education is critically important, and a strong public education system in our country has been the foundation of our Republic and, without question, the strength of our Republic.

This is a moderate and compassionate measure, and I believe it is necessary. We cannot reauthorize this act and say that without improvement, the taxpayers of this country will continue to reward the system.

Taxpayers historically have been very generous when it comes to education. Funding at the local and State level over the last several years across the country has rapidly increased. But it is also time to say, as we do with this amendment and with the reauthorization of ESEA, improvement is now a must; it must be measured, and if you do improve, we will reward you. But if you do not, we will no longer use taxpayers' hard earned dollars to buy mediocrity for the young people of America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

BUDGET CONSIDERATION

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, next week we will be considering the budget of the United States. We have gone through sort of the "Perils of Pauline" here crafting the budget for the country. After much talk of bipartisanship, the other side locked out the Democrats from the conference committee. That is the meeting between the House and the Senate budget members to work out the differences between the two sides.

We were invited to the first meeting and told we would not be invited back, that the Republican majority was going to write this budget all on their own, which they have done. So much for bipartisanship.

That is unfortunate. I think we could have crafted a much better result if we would have had a chance to work together. We really had an unprecedented year working on the budget in which there was no markup in the Budget Committee, and now a conference committee to work out the differences between the House version of the budget and the Senate version of the budget completely excluding Democrats from the consideration.

As a result, I think we are going to get an unbalanced budget, a budget

that threatens to put us back into deficit, back into debt, a budget that does not reflect the values of the American people, that does not put a priority on education when everybody is giving speeches about the critical importance of education.

I grew up in a family in which my parents were killed when I was young. My grandparents raised me. My grandmother was a schoolteacher. In our family, education was the priority. It was not just the first priority; it was the second priority; it was the third priority because my grandparents believed that education was what unlocked opportunity for every child. They just did not talk about it; they lived it.

My grandparents, who were successful people but not wealthy by any means, set aside a fund so every one of my brothers and cousins could go on to higher education. As a result, everyone in our family got an advanced degree. There were 13 cousins in my immediate family and everyone got an advanced degree—from a middle-class family. That was because my grandparents truly believed in the value of education. They were right. Those are the right values. Those are American values.

We hear a lot of Senate speeches about education being the priority. When they go to the back room and write a budget, all the speeches are right out the window. It is all hot air. It is all fluff. It does not mean a thing. It is all words—words and not deeds.

That is not right. In fact, it is misleading people to stand up and say they are for education and then go in a back room and cut out every penny of money to strengthen education. They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

We are going to have a real chance to compare votes on education in this Chamber with votes on the budget, and we are going to see how they match up. We are going to see who is being straight with the people they represent and who is not.

Here is what we have learned of this conference report. This is what the President's budget was. This is the Democratic alternative. This is what the Senate passed. This is what is coming out of the conference committee. It is very interesting.

The tax cut has gone up from what was passed in the Senate. But when you look at education—this is the education line. We passed \$308 billion of funding for education, new money for education. What came out of the conference committee? Zero. No money.

It is not just there that this budget fails us. On the environment, the President proposed a huge cut. What came out of the Senate was a substantial cut but not as big as the President's. What has come out of the conference committee? Zero. No new money for protecting the environment.

It does not end there. On strengthening Social Security—to me, this is, along with education, the most valuable because we know—there is not a