

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I congratulate the chairman of the Budget Committee for his victory today and for the way he has conducted himself. I appreciate the relationship we have. We disagree on this budget, but I have great respect for him as a Senator and as a person.

I also thank the staff on both sides. They worked incredibly hard in these last 2 days, in some cases almost around the clock. I thank my staff director, Mary Naylor, for her extraordinary efforts, Sue Nelson, Jim Horney, and the entire group of budget staffers on our side.

I also want to recognize the professionalism of the staff director on the Republican side. Bill Hoagland is a consummate professional, as are the other members of the staff on the Republican side. We have a very professional working relationship. They have worked very hard to produce this document.

One of the great things about the Senate and the Congress is we will be back. These battles are not over. We have a different sense of what the priorities should be for the country, and we will be speaking out on those issues in the days ahead.

Again, I congratulate those on the other side who prevailed on this vote. I look forward to a continuing debate on what should be the fiscal course for the country.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

#### BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

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

Pending:

Jeffords amendment No. 358, in the nature of a substitute.

Kennedy (for Murray) amendment No. 378 (to amendment No. 358), to provide for class size reduction programs.

Kennedy (for Dodd) amendment No. 382 (to amendment No. 358), to remove the 21st century community learning center program from the list of programs covered by performance agreements.

Cleland amendment No. 376 (to amendment No. 358), to provide for school safety enhancement, including the establishment of the National Center for School and Youth Safety.

Biden amendment No. 386 (to amendment No. 358), to establish school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and local school systems, by providing school resource officers who operate in and around elementary and secondary schools.

Specter Modified amendment No. 388 (to amendment No. 378), to provide for class size reduction.

Voinovich amendment No. 389 (to amendment No. 358), to modify provisions relating to State applications and plans and school

improvement to provide for the input of the Governor of the State involved.

Carnahan amendment No. 374 (to amendment No. 358), to improve the quality of education in our Nation's classrooms.

Wellstone amendment No. 403 (to amendment No. 358), to modify provisions relating to State assessments.

Reed amendment No. 425 (to amendment No. 358), to revise provisions regarding the Reading First Program.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 403

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 403.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment is now pending.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will be pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am wondering if the Senator would like to have a rollcall vote.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I would like to have a rollcall vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator be willing to enter into a reasonable time period? It is the noon hour now, just for notice to our Members. We had a good debate on this amendment. It is a very important one. I want to do whatever permits the Senator to make his case again.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I see a unanimous consent request which I think will be fine. I say to my colleague from Massachusetts, like other Senators, I have other amendments to this bill and there will be plenty of time for extended debate later.

This is a good amendment for the Senate to go on record. I am pleased to agree to a time limit.

Mr. President, I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I can propound a unanimous consent request regarding the Senator's amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will be pleased to do so.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Wellstone amendment No. 403, the time between now and 1:45 p.m. today be evenly divided in the usual form, with no second-degree amendments in order. I further ask unanimous consent that the vote occur in relation to the Wellstone amendment at 1:45 p.m. today.

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleagues.

Mr. President, first, I will be clear about this amendment. With this amendment, we want to make sure, as we talk about accountability and testing, that this is done the right way. In

many ways this amendment—really, in all ways, this amendment tracks the consensus in the testing community, the work of the Committee on Economic Development, which is the arm of the business community which is very pro-testing.

We are saying a number of things:

First, it is extremely important that this testing that is done—after all, we are talking about testing every year from age 8 through age 13—that this testing that is done meet the criterion that is comprehensive; that is to say, there are multiple measures for any kind of testing that is done in our country. It is terribly important that is done.

Second, it is important that it be coherent, that there is a connection, there is a relationship that the testing actually tests the curriculum and the subject matter being taught. It seems to me that is the very least we can do for our local school districts.

Third, as we continue, it is important we be able to measure progress over time, how these children are doing.

Moreover, this amendment says that States will provide evidence to the Secretary that the tests they use are of adequate technical quality for each purpose for which they are used. It is very important that this be done the right way.

Finally, it says itemized score analyses should be provided to districts and schools so tests can meet their intended purpose, which is to help the people on the ground, the teachers and the parents, know specifically what their children are struggling with so they can help them do better.

I am absolutely amazed that this amendment has not been accepted. I thought there would be a real consensus behind this amendment. The reason I say this is all across the country, in case colleagues have not taken note of this, they are having a very negative reaction to testing being done the wrong way. We have a lot of very distinguished educators at the higher end level saying we ought not rely on the SAT as a single test. We have parents, children, young people—really starting in the suburbs, interestingly enough—who are rebelling. We are having more and more reports coming out that the really gifted teachers, the very teachers we need in the school districts where children are most underserved, are leaving the profession because they do not want to teach to the standardized test; they do not want to be drill instructors.

In addition, there has been, I think, some very important, moving writing that has come out. Marc Fisher, a columnist with the Washington Post, wrote a piece on May 8. The headline is, "Mountain of Tests Slowly Crushing School Quality." I recommend this piece to my colleagues.

What Marc Fisher is saying, on the basis of what a lot of teachers and a lot of parents are saying, is that if you just have the standardized tests, if you do not do this the right way, if you do

not have multiple measures, if you do not have tests that are actually testing the curriculum that is being taught, then what you are going to have all across the country is drill education.

It is a sad sight to see when you have 8-year-olds and 9-year-olds sitting in straight rows—I have seen it on television—and you have a teacher saying: 2 plus 2 is 4; 3 plus 3 is 6; 5 plus 5 is 10. This goes for education, drill education, for standardized tests, for worksheets that have to be filled out. It is educationally deadening, and not one Senator would want his or her children to be taught that way or would want to see a teacher have to teach that way. But if we are not careful, that is what is going to happen.

My understanding is the administration is opposed to this amendment. I am amazed that any education Senator would be opposed to this amendment.

There is another piece that Marc Fisher wrote today which is a real heartbreaker. "Schools Find Wrong Answers To Test Pressure" is the headline. I am just going to quote the latter part of this piece.

Michael West, a professor at Virginia Commonwealth University, tells me that at his daughter's middle school, students who pass this week's tests have been told they can skip the final week of school. There's a great lesson: First prize—you don't learn.

The testing mania has brought with it a tidal wave of mediocre teaching materials. Julie Philips, a teacher who recently moved from the New York suburbs to Montgomery County, says, "Great books are tossed on the heap so that students can practice writing about short, fable-like tales that test prep writers concoct to imitate what is on the tests. It is so disheartening."

Listen to a third-grade teacher who has taught in a Fairfax County school for 30 years. Here are a few of the things she says she has had to eliminate from her classroom since the SOL tests took over the curriculum:

"We would have a whole biography unit. We would read a biography of a famous American. We would talk about the elements of a biography. Then the children would choose a famous American for a report. They would write their own autobiography. Finally, they would write a biography of one of their parents. It really got the children talking to their parents about their lives. I typed this up and bound it as a book which the children illustrated. (I don't have time anymore. I have to teach to the SOLs.)"

"I would teach a poetry unit. We would explore the various forms of poetry and the children would write at least one poem in each of six forms. They would illustrate them and we would bind them as a book. Something for them to keep forever. (I don't have time anymore. We read some poems and picked out the rhyming words so they can pass their SOLs.)"

"I would teach reading twice a day so the children who were behind could catch up. I was able to raise some children by two years in one school year. (I don't have time anymore. I have to teach to the SOLs. I have to teach how to fill in bubbles.)"

Frustrated by the new test-driven curriculum, this teacher has decided to leave her profession. Is that school reform?

I say to my colleagues: Believe me, next week I will have trigger amendments and I will talk about the mock-

ery of not having the resources so these children will have a chance to succeed. But today you cannot even vote for an amendment that would assure quality of testing so we do not drive the best teachers out of the profession?

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. REID. Senators are wondering what is going to be happening in the next couple of hours. With the courtesy extended to me by the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator has told me he wishes to speak for another 20 minutes or thereabouts on the amendment that is pending, approximately; is that right?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Approximately. I am not sure exactly.

Mr. REID. The only thing we have, Senator LINCOLN is here. She is going to speak for 15 minutes on an amendment she is going to offer. The opposition would ask for 15 minutes. We wanted to have a couple of votes at about quarter until 2.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I certainly want to accommodate other Senators, but I want to hear the arguments against this amendment. I want people to come out here and debate this amendment. I want to have a chance to respond to those arguments.

Mr. REID. Whatever time the Senator has, they will have that time, and if they choose to speak against it, they certainly can. I am wondering if we could have the Senator's agreement that we could have a couple of votes at quarter to 2. The Senator from Arkansas wishes 30 minutes equally divided on her amendment, which would leave the rest of the time for the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to. I want to reserve 5 minutes before the vote to have a chance to summarize and, I say to my colleague from Arkansas, I will certainly try to finish my initial responses. I certainly would like to know what is the basis of the opposition to this amendment.

Mr. REID. If I may say to my friend from Vermont, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 there be two votes, a vote on the Lincoln amendment, which will be offered shortly—there will be a half hour equally divided on that—and there will also be a vote on the Wellstone amendment which is the pending amendment. So the time not used for the Lincoln amendment would be evenly divided for Wellstone and those who want to speak in opposition thereto.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I think I have a unanimous consent request that has a sequence.

Mr. REID. The problem with that is, it asks the Wellstone amendment be laid aside and he wants to finish. Perhaps that may be appropriate. Would the Senator from Minnesota allow the Senator from Arkansas to offer an amendment and speak for 10 or 15 minutes and you have the remaining time until quarter to 2?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Yes. That would be fine. I would be pleased to hear from my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota still controls the time.

Mr. REID. We understand that.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to yield.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wellstone amendment be laid aside and the Senate then turn to amendment 451, and with respect to the Lincoln amendment, the time between now and 1:45 today be equally divided in the usual form with no second-degree amendment in order.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I ask that be amended to allow the Lincoln amendment one-half hour evenly divided.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask that the Lincoln amendment be allowed one-half hour.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I haven't even finished. I am not going to agree to have my amendment set aside right now. I haven't made the case for the amendment. I object. I probably will take another 15 minutes to explain why I think the amendment is so important. Then I would be pleased to yield the floor and we can move to the Lincoln amendment for a while and come back. I certainly don't want to lay the amendment aside right now.

Mr. REID. We are planning on having two votes at 1:45. We will do our best to get to that.

Mr. JEFFORDS. That is something we can work out.

Mr. WELLSTONE. If we would not keep jumping on the floor with the unanimous consent requests, I could be finished in about 8 minutes, and then you can have the floor and we can come back.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two pieces by Marc Fisher be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 2001]

SCHOOLS FIND WRONG ANSWERS TO TEST PRESSURE

(By Marc Fisher)

The fifth-grade girl stands in the foyer of Bethesda Elementary School, capsized in tears. "What's the matter sweetie?" a concerned mother asks. "Can I help?"

The girl sobs and sobs. She cannot speak. Finally, she gulps: "I'm a few minutes late, I missed the bus and now I can't go on the playground."

The mother: "They won't let you go on the playground if you miss the bus?"

Girl: "No, not the regular playground. There's a special MSPAP playground, but you can't go on it unless you come on time and bring your special red pen."

It has come to this. The MSPAP—Maryland School Performance Assessment Program—is Maryland's state-mandated standardized test for children in grades 3, 5, and 8.

It is used to compare how well schools perform. It is, therefore, something principals and teachers desperately want students to take seriously.

How desperately? Bethesda Elementary set up a special playground with triple the usual time for students to play and an array of extra games. "If you're on time every day, are here every day, and do your best on the test, you qualify for the MSPAP Playground," says Principal Michael Castagnola. "It's a motivator. The kids get penalized if they miss a day of the test. They know that if you work hard, you're going to have fun."

And if you miss the bus, what happens? "You go to regular recess," the principal says.

Just imagine the ribbing those kids get. No wonder the little girl was weeping.

We don't need to dwell on the cheating scandals that have hit Montgomery schools two years running, as panicky principals and terrified teachers mortgage their consciences to get the scores up at any cost. This week, at Silver Spring International Middle School, the principal and six other staffers were removed after students were given advance peeks at a state math test.

Those cases are clear enough. Let's look instead at the supposedly ethical ways in which schools twist and tweak kids to get them to take the tests seriously.

In Virginia, where the Standards of Learning tests are much more deadening than the relatively creative MSPAPs, Michelle Crotteau, who teaches 10th- and 11th-grade English in Rockingham County in the Shenandoah Valley, administered the test this week with a heavy heart.

Our students are given a five-point bonus on their final grade if they pass the SOL test in each subject area," she says. "So a student with an 89 or B average for course work who passes an SOL earns an A. Last year, I had two students who failed my course because they did not bother to do most of the coursework, yet these students passed the class because of the five added points. Talk about grade inflation!"

Michael West, a professor at Virginia Commonwealth University, tells me that at his daughter's middle school, students who pass this week's test have been told they can skip the final week of school. There's a great lesson: First prize—you don't learn.

In Maryland, there are MSPAP snacks and MSPAP parties. In Virginia, there are entire classes devoted to preparing for the SOL tests. At Carl Sandburg Middle School in Fairfax County, "Friday SOL prep classes have been going on" since the depth of winter, says eighth-grader Ijeoma Nwatu. "We've recently been given worksheets with test-taking skills, vocabulary terms, graphs and stories." On Friday, the children will work on SOL posters, which, they've been told, will boost their self-esteem.

The testing mania has brought with it a tidal wave of mediocre teaching materials. Julie Philips, a teacher who recently moved from the New York suburbs to Montgomery County, says, "Great books are tossed on the heap so that students can practice writing about short, fable-like tales that test prep writers concoct to imitate what is on the tests. It is so disheartening."

Schools are so fearful of performing poorly that some Virginia districts axed the 15-minute recess to cram in more test prep time. "With the pressure of the SOLs, there is no time for recess built into the schedule," Ron Weaver, principal of a Roanoke County elementary school, told the Roanoke Times. Virginia's Board of Education last year finally ordered elementary schools to reinstate a daily recess.

Some schools responded to the board's cry for a bit of common sense by leading kids on

a three- or four-minute walk after lunch and calling it recess. Three minutes! Other grudgingly restoring a 15-minute recess—by cutting the minutes out of physical education class. Gee, thanks.

Supporters of the testing binge argue that teaching to the test is a good thing, because it ensures that schools will eliminate unnecessary frills and focus on essentials—the reading and math skills that the tests measure.

That one-size-fits-all approach is driving parents nuts in schools where kids are achieving; their kids are losing out on creative lessons and enriching activities because bureaucrats insist that all schools act identically.

But the notion that we must do this for low-achieving students is equally flawed; they need inspiration and individualized attention even more than kids from privileged backgrounds.

Listen to a third-grade teacher who has taught in a Fairfax County school for 30 years. Here are a few of the things she says she has had to eliminate from her classroom since the SOL tests took over the curriculum:

"We would have a whole biography unit. We would read a biography of a famous American. We would talk about the elements of a biography. Then the children would choose a famous American for a report. They would write their own autobiography. Finally, they would write a biography of one of their parents. It really got the children talking to their parents about their lives. I typed this up and bound it as a book which the children illustrated. (I don't have time anymore. I have to teach to the SOLs.)

"I would teach a poetry unit. We would explore the various forms of poetry and the children would write at least one poem in each of six forms. They would illustrate them and we would bind them as a book. Something for them to keep forever. (I don't have time anymore. We read some poems and picked out the rhyming words so they can pass their SOLs.)

"I would teach reading twice a day so the children who were behind could catch up. I was able to raise some children by two years in one school year. (I don't have time anymore. I have to teach to the SOLs. I have to teach how to fill in bubbles.)"

Frustrated by the new test-driven curriculum, this teacher has decided to leave her profession. Is that school reform?

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 2001]

MOUNTAIN OF TESTS SLOWLY CRUSHING  
SCHOOL QUALITY  
(By Marc Fisher)

Those who say the culture wars are over must not have children of school age. The struggles that have divided the nation for 20 years—the phonics fracas, the New Math mess, the tiff over teaching morality—pale next to the brewing battle over testing.

Just as President Bush and Congress reach consensus on mandating even more testing for the nation's children, colleges by the dozens step away from the SATs as a primary arbiter of who gets in. Just as parents in poor schools rally to use standardized tests to rid themselves of incompetent teachers, parents in more affluent schools stage boycotts of the very same tests.

And just as D-Day looms for high-stakes testing programs like those in Virginia and Maryland that will deny diplomas to kids who flunk the tests, parents and teachers alike raise the alarm about classrooms where creativity, variety and inspiration are becoming dirty words.

In Montgomery County, students reel under the burden of 50 hours of testing each

year, including the state-mandated MSPAPs, three other state test programs and the county-imposed CRTs. The 50 hours doesn't include PSATs, SATs or Advanced Placement tests. Now, if Bush has his way, there'll be nationally required tests as well.

In Virginia, the load is lighter, but the grumbling just as heavy, especially as we near 2004, when thousands of seniors will be denied diplomas if they fail the Standards of Learning tests.

In wealthy Scarsdale, N.Y., more than half of the eighth-graders stayed home during last week's state testing, capping a boycott organized by parents fed up with testing and its pernicious deadening impact on their kids' education.

In the District, a relative handful of parents—based in affluent Northwest Washington—attempted a similar boycott of last month's exams.

Caleb Rossiter, who teachers statistics at American University, led the boycott, keeping his first-grader home from Key Elementary in the Palisades. "My son has had a whole series of Stanford-9 prep days at school, when they work over and over on multiple choice questions and how to fill in the bubbles correctly," he says. "If you could see how they waste students' time with all this test prep—it's so disheartening."

Rossiter approached everyone from his son's teacher on up to Superintendent Paul L. Vance, asking why first-graders, many of whom can barely read, should be subjected to testing. "Everyone I talked to said there's no educational justification for this," Rossiter says. "They use the tests to grade the teachers and the principal, which everyone agrees the tests were not designed to do."

As a statistician, Rossiter likes tests. He understands how useful they can be in diagnosing learning problems. But he and those who write the tests are offended by their misuse—even as those companies rake in millions in the nation's testing binge.

Tests that were never meant to do anything of the sort are now used to determine teacher pay and to judge the quality of schools. Even though research has repeatedly shown that affluence is the strongest indicator of test success, scores are now used to declare some schools losers and others—such as the Prince George's County schools yesterday—winners.

The most corrosive effects of this measurement mania are the emerging class and racial divisions over testing. "It just breaks my heart when I see parents stand up and cheer when they hear that some number of kids in their school have had their scores drawn up above Below Basic on the tests," Rossiter says. "They don't see what the effort to bring up the scores is doing to the curriculum."

They don't see the dispiriting effect of scrapping art, music and physical education because they are not on the tests. They don't see the minds that go uninspired because teachers must forsake their craft to focus like drones on getting the scores up.

"Testing is even more damaging in low-income schools because that's where you need the most creative teaching," Rossiter says.

But testing is a lot cheaper than paying teachers a decent wage, and testing makes politicians look tough, so we will test and test. And one day, we will look up and see how we have crushed our schools, and tests—which when used properly have lifted the educational fortunes of many poor and middle-income children—will end up the culprit, and the pendulum will swing to the other extreme, zipping right past the happy medium.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me explain what this amendment does.

By the way, so we can be clear we already know—I am going to summarize—we actually already know which children are doing well and which children are not doing so well. Children who come from families who are low income, where they do not have the same opportunities other children have for the very best developmental childcare, children who attend schools that don't have anywhere near the same resources that more affluent schools have, children who live in inadequate housing and all too often their parents move two or three times during the school year, children who are in schools where sometimes during the school year there are two or three or four teachers who come in and try to teach and can't, and who do not have the best teachers, students who are in schools where the teachers don't make nearly the salaries and don't have nearly the access to technology, we already know these children are not going to do well on these tests. We already know.

Actually, what we are going to do—and I will speak more about this next week—is something that is incredibly cruel. We are going to fail these children again because all of this authorization is fiction. We have no agreement on any resources. We just had a budget that gives instructions to appropriators, which means we are going to have but a pittance.

I will have a particular amendment next week that says we do the testing when we live up to the Dodd amendment and fund title I at that level.

By the way, when we are talking about these children and about full funding over 10 years, why are we waiting 10 years, I ask my colleagues. If a child is 8 years old now, 10 years from now when we fully fund these programs, although we don't have any commitment to do so yet, that child will be 18. Childhood is once. You don't recover your childhood. Why aren't we helping these children now? Where in the budget are the resources to help these children now? Where is the commitment to help these children now? Instead, you are going to have people pounding their chests saying they are all for accountability.

These tests don't do a thing when it comes to getting a good teacher, when it comes to a smaller class size, or when it comes to making sure children come to kindergarten ready. None of that is accomplished.

I say to my colleagues, at the very minimum let's at least not drive out good teachers. Let's not make the mistake of discouraging the very best women and men from going into teaching. Let's not drive out good teachers by forcing them to be involved in drill education where they basically are having to teach the tests and that is all that it is about and no more. So they drop social studies, they drop music, they drop theater, and they drop art. None of it is tested.

This amendment says we make the commitment that these tests around

the country, if we are going to talk about accountability, are comprehensive. Don't use just one measurement. In addition, they are coherent. They are a measurement that the curriculum is being taught, that they are continuous, and we can see how a child is doing over a period of time.

We are saying the States need to provide evidence to the Secretary that the tests they use are adequate and of technical quality for each purpose for which they are used. Why wouldn't you want to go on record making sure we have the high-quality tests used for the purposes for which they are supposed to be used?

Finally, the itemized test scores are provided to the schools so the parents and others know where the children are struggling and how they can do better.

I am telling you, if we don't do this, there are two things that are going to happen. First of all, you are going to have either a lot of children who are going to be held back or put into lower reading groups or math groups or whatever or you are going to have a lot of schools that are going to be identified as failing schools on the basis of single standardized tests.

We all draw from our personal experience. I can certainly tell you that based upon my own personal experience. I am glad that many more schools are looking at more than SATs. I wasn't supposed to graduate from the University of North Carolina based on SAT scores. I worked hard and did great. I wasn't supposed to be a graduate of graduate school on the basis of SAT records. I was lucky enough to get a doctorate degree at age 24.

These tests are not always accurate. Why in the world would you want to defy what every single person in the testing field says—that you should never rely on a single standardized test. You must have multiple measures.

I know there are some students and perhaps some teachers in the gallery today.

The second thing that is going to happen is you are going to drive out the best teachers. You are going to make it impossible for the very communities, the very schools, and the very kids who need the best teachers to get the best teachers because you are going to channel everybody down the road of having to teach the standardized test, to teach the test. What could be more educationally dead?

By the way—I will finish on this—I will have a lot to say about this bill next week. I will spend a lot of time saying it.

First of all, we ought to get the testing right.

Second, without the resources, it is a mockery. It is an absolute mockery. We already know what works and what doesn't work. All we have to do is look at the schools that our children and our grandchildren attend. That is all we have to do.

The schools that Senators' children and grandchildren attend are good

schools. They are beautiful. They are inviting. The landscape is lovely. The teachers are highly paid. The classes are small. They don't do drill education. It is exciting and rewarding. And our children and grandchildren, before kindergarten, have been read to widely, know the alphabet, and know computers. They are sophisticated and are ready to learn.

We already know we don't need tests to tell us what works. All we need to do is live up to our own rhetoric and be accountable. We will not be accountable if we jam down the throats of every school district in every State in the United States of America a test without at least some standards to make sure they are high-quality tests that do not lead to what will only be a disaster for education, for these children, and for their teachers. We will not be doing our job if we do not provide the resources to go with the accountability.

Today in this amendment I am focusing on the quality of testing. I would love to find out why—I had the understanding there was strong support for it. Now I understand there isn't. I would like to know in what ways the administration disagrees with this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wellstone amendment be laid aside, and the Senate then turn to the Lincoln amendment No. 451, with 15 minutes under the control of Senator LINCOLN and 5 minutes under the control of Senator JEFFORDS, with no second-degree amendments in order, and, further, following that debate, the remaining time until 1:45 be divided equally on the Wellstone amendment.

I further ask consent that the vote occur in relation to the Lincoln amendment following the Wellstone amendment at 1:45 p.m. today, with 2 minutes prior to the vote for explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Minnesota is in the Chamber. That would give the Senator from Minnesota approximately 50 minutes in additional time to debate the amendment.

I ask the Senator, would that be sufficient?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I actually, first of all, am pleased to speak after the Senator from Arkansas. Second of all, as far as time that I need, I said what I needed to say. I am just interested in what in the world is the opposition to a high-quality testing amendment? I would like to hear what it is people have to say in opposition. So I only need time to respond.

If the Senator from Vermont, and others, support the amendment—which I hope they will—I do not need to respond. If other Senators don't want to come to the Chamber and debate, then there is no one to respond to, so I will

not need a lot of additional time. I already said what I needed to say on this amendment.

Mr. REID. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. President, it is the understanding of the two managers of the bill—one of whom is not here—on these two amendments there would be no second-degree amendments?

Mr. JEFFORDS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Vermont, the Senator from Arkansas is on her way to the Chamber. She will be here momentarily. In the meantime, 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.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 451 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] proposes an amendment numbered 451 to amendment No. 358.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding, and authorize appropriations for, part A and part D of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

**SEC. 902. SENSE OF THE SENATE; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should appropriate \$750,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 to carry out part A and part D of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and thereby—

(1) provide that schools, local educational agencies, and States have the resources they need to assist all limited English proficient students in attaining proficiency in the English language, and meeting the same challenging State content and student performance standards that all students are expected to meet in core academic subjects;

(2) provide for the development and implementation of bilingual education programs and language instruction educational programs that are tied to scientifically based research, and that effectively serve limited English proficient students; and

(3) provide for the development of programs that strengthen and improve the professional training of educational personnel who work with limited English proficient students.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out part A and part D of title III of the

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—

- (1) \$1,100,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;
- (2) \$1,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;
- (3) \$1,700,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;
- (4) \$2,100,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;
- (5) \$2,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2007; and
- (6) \$2,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

Mr. LINCOLN. Mr. President, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent to add as cosponsors to the amendment Senator BINGAMAN and Senator KENNEDY.

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

Mrs. LINCOLN. Thank you, Mr. President.

Before I describe the specifics of my amendment, I want to take just a few moments to commend Senators JEFFORDS and KENNEDY for their tireless efforts in crafting the bipartisan proposal that is before the Senate today. As someone who works hard to bridge the partisan divide in Washington, I think each Member of this body owes the managers of this particular bill a debt of gratitude for bringing Senators with very different points of view together to find common ground on the most important bill we will likely consider this year.

They have done an excellent job. They have worked tirelessly together. I certainly commend both of them for their good manners and for the diligence with which they have gone about this very important issue. They have demonstrated real leadership in this debate by placing the education of our children above partisan advantage. I am proud to join this bipartisan effort to reform our system of public education by helping States and local school districts raise academic achievement and deliver on the promise of equal opportunity for all students.

I think the way this bill has been brought up also accentuates the opportunity we have to move in a timely way. As the mother of small children who will start kindergarten this fall, I certainly understand that the more time we waste in addressing this critical issue, the more at risk we put more and more young people across this Nation of not being able to achieve their goals.

So I am pleased to note that the bill before us reflects many of the priorities that are important to me and the 500,000 elementary and secondary students in my State of Arkansas. As many of my colleagues know, I have worked with Senator LIEBERMAN and other new Democrats over the last 18 months on a bold ESEA reform proposal known as the three R's bill. Our bill took a new approach to Federal education policy by combining the concepts of increased funding, targeting, flexibility and accountability to help our school districts meet higher standards.

If there is one thing we have come to know about education, it is that you do not get something for nothing. We have to make a priority in this Nation of in-

vesting in education. This bill and this session gives us that opportunity to meet the mark and to actually do what it is we say we want to do.

One fundamental component of our plan, which is also a part of the BEST bill, is a commitment to give States the resources they need to help all limited English proficient students attain proficiency in the English language and achieve high levels of learning in all subjects.

The amendment I offer today recognizes that we aren't doing enough at the Federal level to provide the vast majority of LEP students in this Nation with the educational services they need to be successful under this new framework. This year, we will spend \$460 million to serve LEP and immigrant students but only 17 percent of eligible children will benefit from these programs.

My amendment calls on Congress to appropriate \$750 million for language instruction programs and services in fiscal year 2002. Also, my amendment would authorize additional funding over the next 6 years so all LEP and immigrant students could receive services under title III within 7 years. Under this approach, funding will be distributed to States and local districts through a reliable formula based on the number of students who need help with their English proficiency. It is so essential, if we are going to ask these students to meet the performance standards in our schools, that we indicate we have left the status quo of education in this country and have moved beyond to the 21st century. We must give them the tools in order to do so.

If you have visited many schools in your States lately, you have probably heard about the challenges schools and educators face in serving the growing number of students in need of LEP programs. From 1989 to the year 2000, the enrollment of limited-English-proficient students in our Nation's schools grew by 104 percent, from 2 million to an estimated 4.1 million today. During this same time period, total school enrollment grew only by 14 percent.

My State of Arkansas is a prime example of the trend that is occurring across this great Nation, especially in Southern States. According to the most recent census estimates, the Hispanic population in our State of Arkansas grew 337 percent since 1990, which is believed to be the largest percentage of growth in the Nation. Not surprisingly, the number of LEP students in Arkansas has increased dramatically in recent years as well. Since 1994, the number of LEP students enrolled in Arkansas public schools has increased by 80 percent, from 2,172 students to 10,599 students today.

Other States have experienced a similar increase in the number of students in need of services under title III. Between fiscal year 1999 and the year 2000, the percentage of immigrant students grew dramatically in the following States: Connecticut by 72 percent; Georgia by 39 percent; Louisiana

by 34 percent; Michigan by 35 percent; Missouri, our neighboring State to the north, grew by 50 percent; Oregon by 28; Tennessee by 33 percent; and Utah by 38 percent.

The need to do more to serve these students and the educators who are responsible for teaching them is clear. Providing more resources alone won't bring about reform or help close the achievement gap which persists between LEP and non-LEP students. Under the BEST bill, States will have to establish and meet annual performance goals for LEP students or face sanctions. In addition, all LEP students must attain the State's proficient level of performance within 10 years. This is a new approach that represents an important change from the past where too often low expectations for LEP students and immigrant students has resulted in low performance in the classroom. Our Nation and its economy cannot tolerate that approach to educating our children any longer.

In closing, I hope my colleagues will support my amendment which expresses a strong commitment to enhance educational opportunities for LEP students by increasing and distributing Federal resources for LEP programs in a reliable way and requiring LEP and immigrant students to meet higher standards. If we are going to ask these students to master English and meet the same challenging State content and student performance standards that all students are expected to meet, which we must do under this bill, then we need to provide States and local school districts with the resources they need to meet this new challenge.

I thank all of my colleagues for their support and encourage their vote in favor of the amendment. Attention to this issue is growing in so many of our States.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold, please.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 403, AS MODIFIED

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I really will not need to take much more time. In a few moments, I am going to ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment. There isn't anything I have said that I would change. I just think part of the disagreement, at least with the Senator from Vermont, was more semantics. I am intending the quality of testing language here to apply to this act, this piece of legislation, this reauthorization of the ESEA.

I haven't resolved this one way or the other yet. In my own mind, I have a

question as to whether or not the Federal Government ought to be telling the school districts—I really mean this—in States across the country that you will do this testing, and you will do it every year in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 with every kid. That is a philosophical question.

The second concern I have is that in terms of our involvement and the ways in which schools are going to be measured and accountability is going to be defined, I want to make sure we have the necessary language that deals with quality, and again I, in particular, would emphasize the importance of comprehensiveness, multiple measures, and coherence, tests measuring the curriculum and what is being taught, and that it is continuous so that we see how children are doing over time.

I don't know how other Senators will vote, but I am certainly pleased to have had the discussion with my colleague from Vermont.

I send my amendment to the desk and ask that the amendment be modified.

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

The amendment (No. 403), as modified, reads as follows:

On page 46, strike line 19 and replace with the following:

“assessments developed and used by national experts on educational testing.

“(D) be used only if the State provides to the Secretary evidence from the test publisher or other relevant sources that the assessment used is of adequate technical quality for each purpose required under this Act, and such evidence is made public by the Secretary upon request.”

On page 46, line 20, strike “(D)” and insert “(E)”.

On page 51, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

“(K) enable itemized score analyses to be reported to schools and local educational agencies in a way that parents, teachers, schools, and local educational agencies can interpret and address the specific academic needs of individual students as indicated by the students' performance on assessment items.”

On page 125, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

**SEC. 118A. GRANTS FOR ENHANCED ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS.**

Part A of title I (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1117 (20 U.S.C. 6318) the following:

**“SEC. 1117A. GRANTS FOR ENHANCED ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS.**

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to—

“(1) enable States (or consortia or States) and local educational agencies (or consortia of local educational agencies) to collaborate with institutions of higher education, other research institutions, and other organizations to improve the quality and fairness of State assessment systems beyond the basic requirements for assessment systems described in section 1111(b)(3);

“(2) characterize student achievement in terms of multiple aspects of proficiency;

“(3) chart student progress over time;

“(4) closely track curriculum and instruction; and

“(5) monitor and improve judgments based on informed evaluations of student performance.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to

carry out this section \$200,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.

“(c) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants to States and local educational agencies to enable the States and local educational agencies to carry out the purpose described in subsection (a).

“(d) APPLICATION.—In order to receive a grant under this section for any fiscal year, a State or local educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(e) AUTHORIZED USE OF FUNDS.—A State or local educational agency having an application approved under subsection (d) shall use the grant funds received under this section to collaborate with institutions of higher education or other research institutions, experts on curriculum, teachers, administrators, parents, and assessment developers for the purpose of developing enhanced assessments that are aligned with standards and curriculum, are valid and reliable for the purposes for which the assessments are to be used, are grade-appropriate, include multiple measures of student achievement from multiple sources, and otherwise meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3). Such assessments shall strive to better measure higher order thinking skills, understanding, analytical ability, and learning over time through the development of assessment tools that include techniques such as performance, curriculum-, and technology-based assessments.

“(f) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Each State or local educational agency receiving a grant under this section shall report to the Secretary at the end of the fiscal year for which the State or local educational agency received the grant on the progress of the State or local educational agency in improving the quality and fairness of assessments with respect to the purpose described in subsection (a).”

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to hear from my colleague from Vermont. Sometimes when I feel particularly indignant—and I do right now about where we are heading with this bill, and I have a Senator on the floor whom I respect and like to work with, I don't want the Senator from Vermont to think this is aimed at him.

My third concern, which I will talk about next week, is that we are just going to kind of keep these children thin when it comes to prekindergarten and what is being done for them, and keep them thin when it comes to the additional title I help, which could be pre-K, or extra reading help, or after school, and we are going to keep them thin when it comes to whether or not their schools have the resources and they are able to get the best teachers; and then we are going to put them on the scale, test them, and fail them again.

This doesn't work. The “accountability” without resources doesn't work. But at least this amendment deals in part with the accountability piece, which is to make sure we don't confuse accountability and testing and a single standardized test as one and the same thing. It is not.

So in the spirit of improving this bill, I hope there will be support for this amendment. I thank my colleague



from Vermont for his very useful suggestions. As I say, next week I am going to have some amendments that are going to say, basically, put up or shut up. We voted for the title I authorization—not money. So at least let's not do this testing until we in fact fund it. I am going to have amendments that say that, and I am going to talk about the funding of prekindergarten. If you are going to start testing 8-years-olds, I guarantee you what has much more to do with what 8-year-olds do in school is what happens to them before kindergarten. That is absolutely true. That is what is so wrong about the direction in which we are heading. I will speak about that at great length next week.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, 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. JEFFORDS. 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 Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I want to comment briefly on Senator WELLSTONE's willingness to modify his amendment. We all agree we want high-quality tests, and it is entirely proper the tests required under this act be demonstrably valid and reliable. I appreciate the Senator offering his amendment, and I believe it is vastly improved. Hopefully, it will be acceptable.

The Senate now has returned to consideration of the Better Education for Students and Teachers, called the BEST, Act. We have now spent a little over a week on this bill, and we have made good progress. We have disposed of about a dozen amendments, and we have eight that are pending, most of which I hope we can complete action on quickly.

As my colleagues know, consent was reached that first-degree amendments were to be filed by 5 p.m. yesterday, and I want to bring my colleagues up to date as to those results.

I compliment my colleagues for their interest and industry in preparing the amendments. Somewhere around 280 amendments were filed to the bill. Of course, this number does not include possible second-degree amendments that could be allowed under the rules.

At our current base of 20 amendments a week, we would complete this legislation, say, in another 14 weeks. Obviously, that is about the time we intend to adjourn for the year, if we assume we did not do anything else. Assuming the Senate takes up no other business and all amendments are offered and everybody is happy, that would be fine. Obviously, that is not the case. I urge all my colleagues to make sure when we get back into the amendment process after today that

they cooperate so we can narrow these amendments and hopefully consolidate many of them, or whatever, so we can finalize this bill within the next week or 2.

I hope my colleagues will reflect on what is really important to them and this legislation and communicate to Senator KENNEDY's staff or my staff which amendments they want considered.

At a minimum, I urge my colleagues to restrict themselves to education amendments. I advise my colleagues that I plan to oppose all amendments that are not relevant to the bill regardless of the merits of the particular proposal.

We will obviously have our hands full completing action on this legislation without undertaking debate on largely unrelated issues.

Senators rightly have taken a great interest in this legislation and have proposed hundreds of amendments to the bill. We will do our very best to work with Senators to clear as many amendments as possible and, in turn, will ask our colleagues to identify over the next few days which amendments are their highest priority.

As we move on today, hopefully Members will let us know which amendments they want to pursue so we can narrow the number as soon as possible without having to bother Members with calling up amendments.

I urge my colleagues to please let us know which amendments they really want to have offered, and we will try our best to expedite them.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, first I want to say I am very hopeful that the Senate will overwhelmingly support the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE. He spoke very clearly and effectively about his presentation today. I made comments yesterday about the importance of developing a test which is going to be comprehensive and not just reflective of perhaps the simple rote answers to rote kinds of questions, but real examinations of the thinking process of children and where they need help and assistance.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide valid and reliable tests along with meaningful reforms that enable children to move ahead academically.

That is what we want to try to do with the whole range of tests. We have enough experience now of knowing which ones really can be used for instruments for learning as compared to those which are solely punitive. In too many instances, teachers teach to the

test. In this way, we both fail the student, fail the test, fail the school, and fail the parents.

Senator WELLSTONE's amendment is enormously important. As I tried to point out yesterday, I think the kind of thoughtful examination by those who have been in the field for years in terms of the evaluation, as well as testing, have come to the conclusion that the more comprehensive examination of children done in a timely way and with the supplementary services available can be a very powerful instrument in helping needy children move ahead academically. I am hopeful that will be accepted by the Senate.

I want to say a strong word in support of Senator LINCOLN's amendment in terms of the bilingual education.

One of the themes of this legislation is to try to find out what the challenges are in our local communities but also what works in our local communities in terms of educational achievement and build on that; also, to take that experience, and make sure that the children who ought to be covered in title I will be covered. This amendment is a no-brainer.

If we look at the legislation that we currently have without the acceptance of the Lincoln amendment, we will be denying millions of limited English proficient children the key element in terms of increasing their academic ability with high quality, effective programs in Title III. We are not prescriptive. We give the local communities the choices in terms of the bilingual and language instructional programs that will be available to the schools and to the local communities in terms of helping children who are limited English proficient. Local communities can make judgments and decisions as to which program is suitable for their particular community.

There is a wide range of different evaluations of these programs to demonstrate the ones that have been the most successful. All of that will be available to the local community. What is important is that those services be available to those children. Without those services being available to those children, then we are basically failing those children. It is a very clear group of children that we are failing.

The number of children who fall into the limited English proficiency has virtually doubled over the period of the last 10 years, and is increasing daily. These students are making up a growing number of district's total enrollment. In 9 states the limited English proficient population has grown by 25 percent or more since 1995.

The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas recognizes this growth, and responds to it. It says: Look, we know what works for the local communities. We know that schools throughout the nation have been struggling to serve this population.

For a certain period of time, we thought the only language was going to be Spanish, and that it was just

going to be in Florida, Texas, and California. But we know of the expansion of and the need for these programs in many other areas of our country, including Arkansas, as the Senator has pointed out.

On this chart, the red line shows that the limited-English-proficiency enrollment has increased by 100 percent in the last 10 years, while total enrollment has basically been rather flat over that period of time.

What we also know is, if we do not provide these programs, effectively, these children, almost out of definition, are going to fail in terms of new accountability and testing standards. That, we know. That is a given.

The question is—here, this afternoon, in a few minutes—whether we are going to go on record and say, look, this is a particular group of children who are part of our public school systems—as a result of a variety of factors; the changes in immigration patterns, the changes in our immigration laws—who need assistance.

There are many children who are falling into this category. We know, as sure as we are standing in this Chamber today, that if we do not adopt the Lincoln amendment, we are denying millions of children the kinds of benefits that we know are successful because they have demonstrated success.

I have a number of examples where we have seen local communities that were able to participate in programs, such as what would be included in the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. They have seen dramatic changes in their whole academic attitude. The result is that these children have really blossomed with those kinds of programs. Without them, we are going to be reaching only a very small number of these children who would otherwise be eligible—only 17 percent under the Bush budget. Over the 4 million limited English proficient students nationwide, we are only serving 900,000 at the present time. We aim to serve more. But we need the resources.

We are hopeful, with this legislation, to try to build on tried and tested efforts that have been initiated in different parts of the country and that have been demonstrated to be constructive and productive in enhancing academic achievement—to offer these out to local communities, to let local communities make these decisions. We have given them additional kinds of flexibility. Then we would have accountability in terms of the teachers, in terms of the schools, in terms of the parents, and also new accountability for disadvantaged children who are facing enormous kinds of challenges every single day. Many students struggle with learning English, and meeting challenging academic standards.

If we are really interested in getting a fair start for these children, if we are really interested in no children being left behind, we have, we believe, a program that can do that. But if we do not provide the kinds of targeting assist-

ance with these programs for children who have the limited English proficiency, then effectively we are writing them off, make no mistake about it.

That is what is at stake. That is what is so important.

If we are really interested, we ought to recognize that this is a defined group of children who we have in our schools, and we ought to make sure the children are going to benefit from these programs.

The red line on the chart—which brings us up to the year 2000—shows that the limited English proficient population now numbers more than 4 million students. That number is going to continued to grow. So the question is, Are we going to recognize what is happening in our schools today—what has happened over the last 10 years and what is going to happen in the next 5 years? If we are really interested in trying to make sure these children are not going to be left behind, this is the amendment that can make a major difference.

I congratulate the Senator from Arkansas. I think this is one of the most important amendments we will consider. It is a lifeline in many respects. It is the crutch upon which the other provisions in Title III of this legislation really depend. If we do not provide resources for this program, then the other aspects of this legislation are going to, fail millions of children. That is wrong.

We ought to take what we know. The good Senator from Arkansas has done that and has offered us an opportunity to make this legislation even stronger. We saw a modest increase in our authorization coming out of the committee. But that increase is clearly not enough to do the job. The Lincoln amendment will do the job. I am very hopeful that it will be accepted in the Senate.

Mr. President, whatever time I have remaining, I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 9½ minutes.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding.

In the last few weeks this Senate has begun to focus on what is, by any measure, the most pressing issue before the country; and that is simply the quality of education for America's schoolchildren.

It is a quality-of-life issue. It is an economic issue. It is even a national security issue. A great nation cannot long endure in its position if the quality of education for its children is not paramount. You cannot lead economically, socially, culturally, or even militarily for long if you do not lead in the quality of education for your children.

This reality, I believe, has focused the Senate's attention on funding standards and quality of education. I believe the debate has been promising. The Senate adopted the Dodd amend-

ment to authorize a \$132 billion increase over 10 years in title I aid to poor schools. Currently, the Federal Government provides school districts with only one-third of the assistance for which they are eligible. Under the Dodd measure, by 2011, they will receive 100 percent of the assistance they both need and require.

The Senate adopted the Harkin amendment to meet our Federal commitment to special education by guaranteeing \$181 billion over 10 years for IDEA. This program was enacted by Congress in 1975. The Federal Government promised to pay 40 percent of the per-pupil cost. The reality is, for the year 2000, we have paid simply 13 percent.

The Harkin amendment will make an enormous difference to local school district budgets where the share of the special education funding has increased from 3 percent to 20 percent in total cost since 1975.

But also, I believe that the bill itself—before amendment—does have the underpinnings of genuine reform. The Bush administration's plan does include an emphasis on accountability, standards, and testing. If these provisions of accountability are married with meeting a genuine Federal commitment on special education, training, hiring teachers, and special education, then the Senate can be proud of this legislation. Indeed, to date, we have done exactly that.

Now we turn to the question of construction, the quality of these schools themselves. Most Americans in their communities would not believe what many of us have seen in our States, that in this extraordinary time of American prosperity, economic power, and budget surplus, American students are attending class in gymnasiums, trailers, and hallways. I have seen it in New Jersey, in prosperous communities. It is not a proud statement about our country.

Mr. President, 2,400 schools will have to be built in the next 2 years just to accommodate rising enrollments.

Education reform will be incomplete without dedicating this funding. No standard of accountability or testing will mean anything—indeed, even hiring teachers will mean little—if we do not do something about the quality of the schools themselves.

As strongly as I believe in the building of schools, even that must be complemented by doing something about the human capital, our teachers, for it to be a balanced piece of legislation.

This week we passed the Kennedy amendment which authorized \$3 billion for professional development. By combining professional development with class size reduction, this bill, however, will be jeopardized without keeping the commitment of the Clinton administration to hire 100,000 new teachers. I believe there was nothing more significant accomplished in the Clinton administration than the hiring of these new teachers to reduce class size.



In the Nation, we have hired 30,000 towards that national goal. In my State of New Jersey, 1,500 new teachers are at work today who would not be in place, reducing class size, but for this initiative.

A balanced program in the Senate will have accountability; it will construct new classrooms. But it must also reduce class size. Every study that has ever been chartered has made it clear that the single greatest variable in the quality of education is having more teachers teaching fewer students. Overcrowded classrooms are a direct threat to the ability of our children to learn. We must take disadvantaged students and have them engaged in the classroom to increase performance.

An important element is going to be not only recruiting but also retaining teachers who otherwise are leaving the classroom, who can only be retained by improvements in discipline, but also easing the burden by smaller class size and, of course, by compensation.

In the next decade in New Jersey, more than one-third of our 93,000 teachers are going to retire. It is going to happen. It is a clock that is ticking. Nationwide in the next 11 years, 2.4 million teachers will retire.

As I believe this debate has demonstrated, we have moved beyond a partisan debate. The most significant element in this education discussion is that Democratic and Republican ideas are now being melded together. It is a great moment for the Senate. If we can preserve the Clinton administration's efforts at hiring new teachers to reduce class size, combine the efforts of Democrats in the Senate for school construction to improve the quality of the infrastructure, and take the Bush administration's proposals for accountability and testing and discipline, this Senate can be proud of what we have done. The Harkin and Dodd amendments on special education, on title I, on full funding of IDEA are important beginnings. But it is in the balance whether good legislation can now be made great, reducing class size, constructing the schools that America's children need and deserve.

I believe every Member of the Senate can be proud of this debate to date. Now let's finish and make a good bill great.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty seconds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, both the Wellstone and Lincoln amendments are very important.

One is to make sure we have quality testing that reflects an accurate evaluation of the progress children are making and where the needs are so teachers can work on them and so the children can excel. The other is to make sure the programs are made available to the children who need the

kind of assistance that limited-English programs provide and that has been demonstrated to be effective. We are talking about the neediest children in the country. We are talking about the poorest of the poor, living in enormously trying circumstances, who are trying to understand and make academic progress. Let's make sure that all the support will be there for them.

I believe the yeas and nays have been asked for, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

The Senator from Tennessee has 11 seconds.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, my understanding is we will have a vote at any moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. I will take a moment or two to summarize this amendment.

Again, the amendment focuses on quality testing. The amendment says that everything we are doing within this Elementary and Secondary Education Act which has to do with these tests that are going to take place every year must meet the professional standards. In particular, what I am focused on is that there be multiple measures, not a single measurement; that, again, there be coherence; that the actual curriculum that is being taught is what is being measured; and that we also focus on continuity and are able to look at a child's progress over time.

I am not at all excited about any of the direction here, but any way I can make this bill a better bill, I want to. I certainly hope my colleagues will vote for this amendment.

Again, this budget resolution that was passed tells the story loudly and clearly. We are not going to have the resources going to the schools and the children. Next week I will have amendments that say we go with the testing and accountability when, in fact, we have provided the funding for title I; when, in fact, we have provided funding for early childhood development; when we have done the job by way of getting the tools to the schools and the children and the teachers so they can succeed. That is going to be a long story next week.

For now, I am hoping there is good, strong support for this quality of testing amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining on either side.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 p.m. on Monday, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1 and the Reid amendment No. 460 and there be up to 1 hour for debate to be equally divided in the usual form with no second-degree amendments in order.

I further ask unanimous consent that following that debate, the amendment be laid aside and at 4 p.m. the Senate resume consideration of amendment No. 376 offered by Senator CLELAND and there be up to 1 hour for debate on that amendment with no second-degree amendments in order.

I further ask unanimous consent that a vote occur in relation to that amendment following the Reid amendment with 2 minutes prior to the vote for explanation.

I further ask unanimous consent that a vote occur in relation to the Reid amendment at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that there would be no second-degree amendments to the amendments of Senators REID and CLELAND.

Mr. FRIST. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the Wellstone amendment No. 403, as modified.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 99 Leg.]

#### YEAS—50

Akaka	Dodd	Levin
Baucus	Dorgan	Lieberman
Bayh	Durbin	Lincoln
Biden	Edwards	Mikulski
Bingaman	Feingold	Murray
Breaux	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Byrd	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Campbell	Harkin	Reed
Cantwell	Hollings	Reid
Carnahan	Inouye	Rockefeller
Carper	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Cleland	Johnson	Schumer
Clinton	Kennedy	Stabenow
Conrad	Kerry	Torricelli
Corzine	Kohl	Wellstone
Daschle	Landrieu	Wyden
Dayton	Leahy	

#### NAYS—47

Allard	Bond	Burns
Allen	Brownback	Chafee
Bennett	Bunning	Cochran

Collins	Hutchinson	Sessions
Craig	Hutchison	Shelby
DeWine	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Domenici	Kyl	Smith (OR)
Enzi	Lott	Snowe
Fitzgerald	Lugar	Specter
Frist	McCain	Stevens
Gramm	McConnell	Thomas
Grassley	Miller	Thompson
Gregg	Murkowski	Thurmond
Hagel	Nickles	Voinovich
Hatch	Roberts	Warner
Helms	Santorum	

NOT VOTING—3

Boxer	Crapo	Ensign
-------	-------	--------

The amendment (No. 403), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 451

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes evenly divided on the Lincoln amendment No. 451.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, the amendment on which we are about to vote reconfirms our commitment to give States the resources they need to help all students with limited English proficiency to attain proficiency in the English language and achieve high levels of learning in all subjects.

This year we spent \$460 million to serve LEP and immigrant students, but only 17 percent of eligible children will benefit from these programs. This amendment calls on Congress to appropriate \$750 million for language instruction programs and services in 2002. It would also authorize additional funding over the next 6 years.

The critical part of this is that these children are also going to be judged by standards and tests. We want to be able to give these school districts the capabilities to give these children the tools they need in order to be successful within these standards and these tests. It is absolutely essential if what we want to do in this Nation is to leave the status quo of education and move on to something that is progressive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I have no requests for time. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to Lincoln amendment No. 451.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and

the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 100 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Akaka	Durbin	McCain
Allen	Edwards	Mikulski
Baucus	Feingold	Miller
Bayh	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Campbell	Harkin	Reed
Cantwell	Hollings	Reid
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Rockefeller
Carper	Hutchison	Sarbanes
Chafee	Inouye	Schumer
Cleland	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Clinton	Johnson	Snowe
Collins	Kennedy	Specter
Conrad	Kerry	Stabenow
Corzine	Kohl	Torricelli
Daschle	Landrieu	Voinovich
Dayton	Leahy	Warner
Dodd	Levin	Wellstone
Domenici	Lieberman	Wyden
Dorgan	Lincoln	

NAYS—34

Allard	Gramm	Nickles
Bennett	Grassley	Roberts
Bond	Gregg	Santorum
Brownback	Hagel	Sessions
Bunning	Hatch	Shelby
Burns	Helms	Smith (NH)
Byrd	Inhofe	Stevens
Cochran	Kyl	Thomas
Craig	Lott	Thompson
DeWine	Lugar	Thurmond
Enzi	McConnell	
Frist	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—4

Boxer	Crapo
Breaux	Ensign

The amendment (No. 451) was agreed to.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 534 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

(Purpose: To provide for a Careers to Classrooms program and improve the Troops to Teachers program)

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON], for herself, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BIDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 534.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in the RECORD of May 9, 2001, under "Amendments Submitted.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendments are set aside.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, amendment No. 534 is the Careers to Classrooms Act of 2001. I have several cosponsors who have worked very hard with me to put this amendment together because many of us had ideas along the same line. I thank very much my cosponsors: Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. BIDEN.

We have all worked on this issue because probably every one of us has had some experience that caused us to realize we must do more to recruit teachers into our classrooms. I had the experience of having a very good friend in Greenville, TX, who was a Latin major in college. She taught Latin in a private school, but when she moved to Greenville, she did not have the teacher certification for public school, so she was not able to teach Latin. Well, they didn't offer Latin in Greenville High School, even though they very much wanted to do so. But she was not qualified to teach because she didn't have the teacher certification, even though she had taught Latin in private school and that was her major in college.

So I started thinking, what are we doing, when we have a shortage of teachers, especially in rural classrooms, in urban classrooms, in high-growth areas, where we have subjects that are not being taught—subjects such as math, science, languages—yet we have artificial barriers to bringing people who have expertise into the classroom?

So I modeled the Careers to Classrooms Program—along with my cosponsors—along the lines of the Troops to Teachers Program, which Senator DEWINE will speak about later, which has been so successful in taking retired military personnel who would like to have another career, who are 40, 45, 50 years old, and bringing them into the classroom with all of their myriad of great experience and giving the children in our country the chance to experience this kind of expertise.

This is Careers to Classroom because now we have a number of people who have done very well early in their careers, and they would like to change careers, or they would like to retire from the computer industry. We want to lure those qualified people into the classroom. We want to target the classes that don't have teachers, where we have teacher shortages. So this amendment simply puts forward another opportunity for our school districts to give alternative certification, expedited certification, to encourage teachers to go into the classrooms in areas where we have teacher shortages.

In this legislation, individuals with demonstrable skills in high-need areas would be given the chance to help a school that has a need for teachers in their field. It would provide limited stipend assistance for individuals involved in State alternative certification programs and will agree to

teach in rural schools, schools with the most pressing teacher shortages, and schools with the highest percentage of students from low-income families. So we give incentives through stipends to help them get that teacher certification.

Second, to help offset the additional costs these high-needs schools incur when they accept individuals in the Careers to Classrooms Program, the provision allows States to award grants to such schools to meet these costs.

In other words, we are rewarding the school districts for creativity, for going the extra mile to bring qualified teachers into the classroom, and we are rewarding the person who is willing to go into the classroom by giving assistance for that alternative certification.

I ask that we pass this bill. It is one more way our public schools can give every child an opportunity to reach his or her full potential. That is the goal of public education. It is why public education is so important. We want every child to reach his or her dreams with a public education.

We like private schools. We like parochial schools. We think home schools are fine for many students. But we also want our public schools to be the foundation of our country, and that is exactly what adding more options and more incentives for creativity will do.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will take 3 or 4 minutes. I notice Senator CLINTON is on the floor, and Senator DEWINE is on the floor as well. I say to Senator DEWINE, I will let him cover the Troops to Teachers part of this legislation. It is a real addition, and I like this effort. This whole notion of Careers to Classrooms makes all the sense in the world.

I want to highlight two facts. No. 1, we are focusing again on underserved children and underserved communities, be they inner city, rural, or, for that matter, in a suburb.

No. 2, we want to make it possible for some people to make big career changes, to go into teaching, working with the States, and States having collaborative relationships with higher institutions to provide alternative means for certification and have more lateral entry into teaching.

Some of the best teachers are women and men who midcareer decide to make this change and go into teaching. For my own part—I hope I do not have to do it too soon; some of my colleagues might disagree with me on that—I often think to myself that I would love to do some teaching in the schools I visit all the time. Even though I do have a doctorate in political science and have some experience in the area of social studies, the thought of going back to school and going through the usual certification is a disincentive. We are trying to provide more incentives for people to come into teaching.

Every discussion I have been involved in at every school, once every 2 weeks

for the last 10½ years, if I ask a student what makes for a good education, the first thing they talk about before anything else is good teachers. By the way, they are not talking about teachers who teach the worksheets. They are talking about teachers who fire their imagination.

Finally—and Senator CLINTON may speak about this—it is not just recruitment but retention, having mentors, and providing support for teachers to stay in the profession. We run into the problem of good people leaving the profession. This is terribly important.

This amendment is on target. Each of us wrote our own amendments, our own bills. The Senator from Texas is right; we put this all together in a collaborative relationship. It is a very important amendment. There is widespread support for it, and I am proud to work with my colleagues on this important legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I congratulate my colleagues from Texas, Minnesota, and New York for the great work they have done on this bill. This bill goes to the heart of the challenge we face in the next few years in education. We know a lot of things are important in education. We know we have to have a good building, laboratory equipment, and good books. We have to have different items, but we know the most important thing in education is the teacher.

As my high school principal, Mr. MALONE, told me years ago, there are only two things that really count in education: One is a student who wants to learn and the other is a teacher who can teach. This amendment goes directly to the heart of this issue.

We face a challenge in this country. In the next decade, we will have to produce 1.6 million to 2.6 million new teachers just to replace the teachers today who are getting ready to retire—1.6 to 2.6 million. We know from our experience that the greatest challenge with regard to recruiting these teachers is in the poorer parts of the country—in the inner cities many times, in areas of Appalachia. This is where it is so vitally important for us to attract, retain, and keep the best teachers we can find. We absolutely have to do that. This amendment is targeted directly at that.

I wish to talk for a moment about the part of the bill that we refer to as Troops to Teachers. This is not a new program. It is a program, frankly, we had to fight last year to keep afloat. It is a program that has been proven to work.

The concept is very simple. Every year in this country we have tens of thousands of men and women who retire from the military, and they retire many times at, at least from my point of view now, a relatively young age, the age of 57. They have a lot of time

ahead of them, and they have a great deal of experience. We want to encourage as many of these people as we can who have already proven they can lead other people to go into education, to teach, to take that leadership ability and lead our young people and mold them and work with them to, in turn, become leaders.

It has been a very successful program. This bill expands that program. Let me briefly tell the Members of the Senate what the results of this program have been.

A 1999 study found that 30 percent of Troops to Teachers, 30 percent of the people who go from the military into teaching under this program, are minorities. That is compared to only 10 percent of all teachers. Thirty percent of these former troops are now teachers and teaching math. Many of them are involved in teaching science. These are two subjects for which we know it is always difficult to find quality people to teach and people who have that background.

Twenty-five percent of the Troops to Teachers teach in urban schools; 90 percent are male, compared to the current teaching force, which is 74 percent female. Many educators tell us we need more males to go into teaching, particularly in K-6, 7, 8, the primary education. Troops to Teachers has proven this will, in fact, work and helps to do that.

I congratulate my colleagues for their work on this issue. The Troops to Teachers provision is something I have worked on for some time. I have had the chance in my State of Ohio to meet with people who have been troops who are now teachers. It is phenomenal to see their enthusiasm but, more importantly, to see the enthusiasm of their students. It really makes a difference in these children's lives.

This is an amendment that goes right at the heart of our problems and our concerns and that is to improve the quality of teaching in this country and to continue to do what we can to recruit the best people we can and put them into education and let them teach our young people.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am so pleased to join my colleagues supporting this amendment, Careers to Classrooms. I commend my good friend from Texas who brought all of us together, took all of our various ideas, and came up with an amendment that I believe will make a tremendous difference in one of the most serious problems facing us in education. This is an issue all of us who joined together as original cosponsors have worked on because it is one that came to us in our respective States.

I brought along just three sample headlines from 3 different years. The first, from August of 1998, from the Buffalo News, reports that more than half of the teachers in New York State,

201,000, were headed for retirement in the next 10 years.

Then a year later, in August 1999, the New York Times ran a story on the front page alerting the public that as children were heading back to school, cities and towns across our country were struggling to fill the teacher slots, especially in our poorest neighborhoods, and especially in difficult subjects such as math and science and special ed.

Then, again, in August 2000, the New York Times focused on Westchester County where I live, highlighting the fact that faced with retirements and other departures from the profession, superintendents were spending their time desperately searching for teachers to be there when school opened.

I think all of us who joined together on this amendment do not want to see these headlines anymore. We think it is time that, from August 2001 on, the headlines should read that our country is coming together to answer the call to recruit and retain more teachers. I am so pleased that this amendment hits what I see as all of the necessary major points.

As Senator HUTCHISON said, it supports alternative routes to certification. I have heard so many stories similar to the one she told about her friend, the Latin teacher, who could not get a job in the public schools. As Senator DEWINE points out, it continues to support and fund the very successful Troops to Teachers Program. As Senator WELLSTONE points out, it begins to provide the resources that our high-need school districts will require in order to place them at the head of the queue to try to attract teachers. I am pleased it will permit each local school district to develop a local teacher corps, which would be able to provide bonuses for midcareer professionals interested in becoming teachers.

I have often said if we give signing bonuses to athletes, we ought to give signing bonuses to teachers. There is not any more important job in our country. All too often our teachers are relegated to the margins of our concerns. The teacher corps would also be able to make scholarships available for recent college students and create new career ladders for teacher's aides to become fully certified teachers. A lot of our teacher's aides want to become teachers. If they are performing well, if they have the requisite academic skills, we ought to encourage their development.

It will also provide additional mentoring, support, and professional development that is needed to become an effective teacher.

All in all, I am so pleased that we have an opportunity to address this important issue in this bill because if we do not address the quality and the quantity of our teaching force, we are not going to be able to deliver on all the other promises we are trying to make and keep with the children, teachers, and parents of our country.

I know in New York City we are looking desperately to fill the slots that are needed for our teachers. This kind of program of alternative certification and additional mentoring, similar to what we call the New York City Teaching Fellows Program, will help us recruit and retain our teachers.

In addition to promoting alternative routes to full certification, I am pleased that in the underlying bill as part of S. 1 we have the National Teacher Recruitment Campaign to alert prospective teachers from across the country about these new resources and routes to teaching and include a National Teacher Recruitment Clearinghouse so someone, anywhere in the country, can sign on to the Web and find out information about where they are living now or where they hope to move so we can really attract people who are the best and the brightest into teaching.

I am excited about this opportunity. I commend all my colleagues who have worked in a collegial and bipartisan manner, representing States from Texas to Ohio to Minnesota to New York, to send a clear message that teacher recruitment and retention is not a partisan issue. It is at the root of how successful we can be in improving education. I am so pleased we are going to have a chance to vote on this amendment and send that clear message to the people of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank all of my colleagues who have spoken so eloquently. I think Senator WELLSTONE, Senator CLINTON, Senator DEWINE, and I have each addressed a separate part of this bill. We have each addressed something from our own States that we have seen that caused us to come together to try to alleviate the critical teacher shortage that we have in public schools throughout our Nation.

I think this is one more way that we will be able to add more creativity and more options to our arsenal of weapons that we have to combat the teacher shortage that we are seeing in our country.

I thank all my colleagues.

If there is no one else wishing to speak on this amendment, I urge adoption of amendment No. 534.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 534) was agreed to.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. President. I think we have taken a great step forward. I hope in the final bill this is a very big part of the reform we are all seeking in public education.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, thanks to my colleague, especially for her leadership on this issue.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today as we debate one of the most important issues to come before us in the Senate—the education of our children—and to urge my colleagues to support the Careers to Classrooms amendment.

If you have listened to the debate, there is not a single Senator who is satisfied with the quality of education in our public schools. We are unanimous in our belief that U.S. schools must do better in this global, competitive, ideas-based world.

In my own State, New Yorkers were shocked to learn that more than one-third of the State's students performed below the basic level of achievement in reading. Over the last 8 years, the number of New York State schools cited for poor performance has more than doubled, and this is simply unacceptable.

When you look at the studies, you see that they show that the greatest influence on how a young person performs in school is their parents and the values and oversight their parents are giving. There is something we can do about that, but not very much—at least in this bill.

Second is the quality of our teachers. On this bill, if we could only accomplish one thing—I hope it will accomplish many more than that—if we could make only one change to our schools to raise the quality of education for all kids, it would be to improve the quality of our teachers and make the teaching profession more attractive to young people and midcareer professionals alike.

In the past, America was able to attract high-quality individuals into teaching. We had three cohorts of people who went into teaching:

In the 1930s and 1940s, we had New Dealers—people who were raised in the Depression and got that civil service job because they did not want to be fired, even if it paid a little less.

In the 1950s and 1960s, there were not many opportunities for women, and millions of young, bright American women were told, “Go be a teacher,” and, “Go be a nurse.” To our great luck as a nation and to my great luck as a student who was taught by many of them, many of them did go into teaching.

The final cohort were the young men in the late 1960s and early 1970s who, because you received a draft deferment when you taught, went into teaching.

My children attend public schools in New York City. At Open School Night, I asked the six teachers of my daughter who is in high school how they got into teaching. They are women who had gotten into teaching in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, and they are men all about my age—I am 50—who had become teachers during the Vietnam war.

Those three groups of people are gone. New Deal, not too many people who lived in the shadow of the Depression are going into professions now; Women, thank God there are many more opportunities; and, again, thank God we don't have a Vietnam war that drove men into teaching.

As a result, because of that, our teachers are old.

This chart shows the age of teachers in America. This big bump shows teachers 47 to 49 in my State. I think the No. 1 age—the “immediate mode” I think it is called—of the teacher, the most frequent age of any, is 53.

In the next 10 years, we are going to have huge numbers of our teachers retire, and they are going to have to be replaced. The \$64,000 question for education is, Who is going to replace them?

One thing we know. Today, to choose to teach is to choose financial sacrifice. Teacher salaries do not compare with other possible options facing graduates. In fact, over the past 4 years salary offers for college graduates in all fields have grown at twice the rate of those for new teachers. Isn't that incredible that in America, where we value education, salaries for teachers grew at half the rate of others?

This chart tells the story about why we are having such difficulty attracting good teachers. The starting salary for computer programming is \$44,000, for accounting is \$37,000, for market research is \$34,000, and for a paralegal is \$45,000. But the starting salary for a teacher with a bachelor's degree in America is \$26,700.

So a qualified young person, idealistic though they may be, can often make \$10,000, \$15,000, or even \$20,000 more starting out by going into another profession.

What job could be more important than teaching? It is the most important job in America in the 21st century. Teaching should be an exalted profession the way medicine and law were in the 20th century. That is not just something that sounds nice; that is if we want to keep America the leading country in the world.

Yet this most important job has become less and less and less attractive compared to other jobs financially. That means that quality has become less important than simply filling vacant teacher slots. We have seen it all. We have seen in my city they now are going not just around America but around the world to find young men and women to teach, particularly in math and science. The board of education in New York City found itself lucky that it had a gold mine of Yugoslavian students who wanted to come teach, and Austrian students who wanted to come teach. And they are good to have—better than nothing. But how many of them are going to stay here and become career teachers and gain the invaluable experience in the first 3 or 4 years that a teacher gains?

We cannot continue in this manner. We cannot have so many math and

science teachers not experienced in math and science. We cannot have this global search for people who might teach for a year. We cannot have it for a lot of reasons.

Today's economy depends on the quality of the minds of our young people, the quality of the education we provide in our schools, and, consequently, our children's success depends on the education they receive.

As you can see from the chart, in my own State, in New York City alone, 11,000 teachers could retire by this year's end. And remember that previous chart: One-third of our teachers are eligible to retire in 5 years. That means our country will have to hire or replace close to 2 million teachers over the next decade. And New York State will need to hire 80,000 teachers over the next 5 years.

Studies tell us that teacher qualifications account for more than 90 percent of the differences in students' math and reading scores.

I believe in having more teachers. I support having 100,000 new teachers. But let me tell you this. I would rather have a really good teacher for 21 students than a mediocre teacher for 18. So as much as I support having 100,000 new teachers, I would much rather see us get the best quality teachers, even if it means slightly bigger class size.

We, of course, in an ideal world, should not have to settle between one and the other. But quality and training counts. That is what the studies show. The bad news is that more than 12 percent of all newly hired teachers enter the teaching workforce with no training at all. More than 1 out of 10 teachers have not a single bit of training. They hire you and throw you in a classroom. Isn't that amazing? Would we do that to somebody who is working in a foundry on an assembly line? Would we do it in almost any other job? No. But here it is. And a third of all teachers lack a major or even a minor in the subject they teach. And 33 percent of new teachers nationwide lack full certification.

We all talk about education. We all think that it is the key to our future. And the people who are going into teaching are often financially underpaid, which means, frankly, we do not get the highest quality, and they are untrained when they enter the classroom.

I do not think anyone in this Chamber, from the most conservative to the most liberal, would dispute this statement: Every American child deserves to be taught by a highly qualified, motivated teacher.

So what does that mean? It means that scarce Federal dollars—and they are scarce; particularly, I might add, with this huge tax cut they are even more scarce—it means that scarce Federal dollars should be used to support and help replicate successful programs to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, especially in those districts with the highest need.

I have been working on this piece of legislation since I came to the Senate 2 years ago. We put together something called the “Marshall Plan for Teachers.” I am proud to say that a lot of the things in this amendment—and the ideas were not mine alone; lots of my colleagues had very similar ideas—are very much like the “Marshall Plan” that we introduced and talked about.

I am very proud to have worked with so many of my colleagues—of course, Senator KENNEDY in the lead, and Senators HUTCHISON, WELLSTONE, CRAPO, CLINTON, DEWINE, and BIDEN—on this amendment to provide Federal support for States and local districts to recruit and retain midcareer professionals and to attract young people into the teaching profession. To me, it is the most important part of this bill.

There are many important parts. Federal dollars will help establish, expand, or enhance programs that provide alternative routes to certification, such as the National Teaching Fellows Program in my city of New York. Dollars will be targeted to the areas where they are needed most—districts and schools with high numbers of low-income families, high numbers of uncertified teachers, and high teacher turnover.

Similar to legislation I introduced this Congress, our amendment would provide funds that could be used to recruit new teachers through incentives, scholarships, tax credits, or stipends, as long as these efforts are linked to effective retention activities such as mentoring programs and high-quality, in-service professional development opportunities.

We know that 20 percent of new teachers leave the profession within their first 3 years of service. And nearly 10 percent leave within the first year. We must be committed to providing incentives to attract highly qualified people and provide the resources and opportunities to keep people teaching.

The amendment would support collaboration—partnerships, if you will—between local districts, parents, colleges, and universities, and community leaders to develop effective recruitment and retention strategies.

In addition, we would support accelerated paraprofessional-to-teacher programs and State and regionwide clearinghouses for recruitment and placement. And we would expand upon the successful Troops to Teachers Program.

Because accountability is so crucial to the success of our efforts, the amendment would require an evaluation report from each grantee to determine whether we have increased the number of certified, highly qualified teachers teaching the subject areas in which they have experience, decreased teacher shortages in high-need subject areas, and increased teacher retention.

It is time to make a change. This amendment will get us on the way to what I know is a goal shared by all of

us: a qualified teacher in every classroom in America.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I am happy to yield to our friend and leader from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank my friend and colleague from New York for offering this amendment. I would appreciate his opinion on this. I have seen, in a number of different situations, where there are many individuals in different professions who are skilled in math and science and other areas in the new economy. And there are individuals who are retiring.

If they had some way, some pathway to go into teaching, we would find that there is a great deal of interest. What the Senator is attempting to do is create a pathway for individuals who may have gone into a career for a period of time and have been able to have achievement in terms of their professional careers but then, with this kind of an opportunity that is included in the Schumer amendment, they would be able to have a career change and, with the kind of training and what they would bring to teaching as achievement in a number of different potential areas, they would be able to be of a real advantage to these students.

Many of us have seen, for example, the Troops to Teachers Program where we have had a number of members of the U.S. Navy, particularly in the areas of—well, the submarine fleet comes the closest in the State of Washington, I believe, where a number of the people who retired from the Navy stayed in the area. These are people with enormous kinds of understanding and a great deal of training in terms of math and in terms of science. When they were offered this opportunity to engage in the schools—it is also true in a number of districts in Florida and in other communities where there were significant numbers of retirees in the military—when they opened up the opportunity for these servicemen to go into teaching, they just went in droves. The positive impact it has had in the schools in the areas of math and science has been absolutely extraordinary.

As I was listening to the Senator, it seems to me that this is sort of a particular situation, but there are going to be other professions as well where individuals, through the Senator's amendment, could get into the areas of teaching and have a rewarding and satisfying and inspiring career and also make a real difference in terms of children's appreciation for learning as well as enhancing their skills academically.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator for his question. He is right on the money, as usual. There are so many people in modern America in the military—the Troops to Teachers—so many other professions who retire early; they receive their pensions after 25 years;

they say they are not going to work at this job any longer because they are getting a good pension, whatever, who would love to teach, who would just love to teach.

I myself, as everyone here, have been invited into classrooms to teach. Come to Cunningham Junior High School and teach 8th grade social studies for a day or come to Madison High School and teach 11th grade history for a morning. I guess I am not atypical. I love it. When these people who have retired, who have such skills, get a taste of teaching, they love it.

One of the things we do in this amendment—and the Senator is correct to point this out—is make it a lot easier for them to go into teaching. There are no inadvertent barriers in the way.

In this bill, we allow them to go teach. These days they could have 15 or 20 productive years as a teacher after their original career. The Senator is exactly correct. As we try to think of how to attract new teachers, this group of people is one of the great untapped resources. I hope, through this amendment, we can tap it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I commend the Senator. We have seen awakened in this country, particularly in recent times, a sense of voluntarism. I think voluntarism is alive and well in the United States. Many of us hope that our young people, whatever their disposition, will be more involved in the public policy aspects of our country. You can't get away from the fact of their involvement in terms of volunteerism. I have seen it in our high-tech area in my own State of Massachusetts with our "netdays" where Massachusetts was 48 out of 50 States in terms of Internet access. And basically, through asking the high-tech industry to tie up with local schools, we have moved now into No. 11. We have what we call "netdays." The private sector in the high-tech area, the software industry, has been enormously responsive in adopting schools, and labor laid down 350 miles of cable in Boston voluntarily on Saturdays because their children were going to these schools.

Schools have an enormous ring in terms of our value system. To challenge our society in ways which they haven't been challenged before, in terms of giving people an opportunity to be a part of an educational system, would get a very positive response. We shouldn't miss the opportunity to at least challenge professionals in that area. The good Senator's amendment will help enormously in being able to do it.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JEFFORDS. If the Senator will yield, I would like to share some experiences I have had in this area also.

As you may remember, a few years ago, Congress took back—sort of—the school system of the District of Columbia. I had the opportunity of sort of

being the de facto superintendent of schools for awhile. I have been following up on some of the problems they have had, as all schools are having, with finding teachers who are qualified. I find that the only teachers they can get in the science and math area are retired people who have come back in and had some sort of a certification process to make sure they knew the basics about teaching.

Also, in Vermont, we have one of the largest IBM plants, and we have the same shortage of teachers. They are finding there that the source of getting good teachers back into the schools is from the retired IBM employees.

This is an idea we have been talking quite a bit about today. I wanted to share those experiences with the Senate because we have to do everything we can. At some point, the States would be better to do that, to make sure the standards just of the common capabilities of teaching are there and all that sort of thing.

I commend the Senator on his amendment and the Hutchison amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator from Vermont not only for his insight but for his great leadership on this bill. One of the reasons we have such a broad and bipartisan bill is because of the Senator's leadership, as well as my friend from Massachusetts.

Teaching is so fulfilling. It is a great job, if people get a taste of it, as both Senators from Massachusetts and Vermont have said. Whether you are a retired military person or a retired person from technology or a retired small businessperson, I say: Look at teaching. If we can pass this legislation with the amendment that so many of us on both sides of the aisle have put together, we will make it easier for you to get into teaching.

Given the importance of teaching to America and given what a fulfilling job it is, maybe this amendment will really help the children of this generation, and certainly generations in the future, to get the kind of great fulfilling experience they had from great teachers as we each did as we went through elementary and secondary school.

I thank the Senator for those nice words as well as for his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I plead with my fellow Members of the Senate who may still be here that we are waiting for another Senator to hopefully offer an amendment. We have some 270 remaining to be brought to our attention. Hopefully, we will be here for a little length of time anyway. I am not sure how long. Now is the time.

I yield the floor to Senator BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.



AMENDMENT NO. 402 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment. The amendment is at the desk. It is amendment No. 402. I call up the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment numbered 402.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide grants for the teaching of traditional American history as a separate subject)

On page 893, after line 14, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ GRANTS FOR THE TEACHING OF TRADITIONAL AMERICAN HISTORY AS A SEPARATE SUBJECT.**

Title IX (as added by section 901) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“PART B—TEACHING OF TRADITIONAL AMERICAN HISTORY**

**“SEC. 9201. GRANTS FOR THE TEACHING OF TRADITIONAL AMERICAN HISTORY AS A SEPARATE SUBJECT.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to enable the Secretary to establish and implement a program to be known as the ‘Teaching American History Grant Program’ under which the Secretary shall award grants on a competitive basis to local educational agencies—

“(1) to carry out activities to promote the teaching of traditional American history in schools as a separate subject; and

“(2) for the development, implementation, and strengthening of programs to teach American history as a separate subject (not as a component of social studies) within the school curricula, including the implementation of activities to improve the quality of instruction and to provide professional development and teacher education activities with respect to American history.

“(b) REQUIRED PARTNERSHIP.—A local educational agency that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall carry out activities under the grant in partnership with 1 or more of the following:

“(1) An institution of higher education.

“(2) A non-profit history or humanities organization.

“(3) A library or museum.”.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment authorizes to be appropriated \$100 million to enable the Secretary to establish and implement a program to be known as “Teaching American History Grant Program” under which the Secretary shall award grants on a competitive basis to local educational agencies—to carry out activities that will promote the teaching of traditional American history in schools as a separate subject; and for the development, implementation, and strengthening of programs to teach American history as a separate subject, not as a component of social studies, within the school curricula, including the implementation of activities to improve the quality of instruction and to provide professional development and teacher education activities with respect to American history.

A local educational agency that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall carry out activities under the grant in partnership with one or more of the following:

(1) An institution of higher education.

(2) A nonprofit history or humanities organization.

(3) A library or museum.

Mr. President, I started school in a two-room schoolhouse 79 years ago, in 1923. It was 1924 that John W. Davis of Clarksburg was nominated on the 103rd ballot for the office of President of the United States. He was defeated by Calvin Coolidge.

My first teacher was a woman by the name of Carrico. Her husband had lost his arm as a brakeman on, I believe, the N&W railroad. Mrs. Carrico was my first teacher and she taught the lower grades.

We started out in the Primer and the main character in that primer was Baby Ray. And there were two rooms, as I say. In the other room, a man by the name of Lawrence Jennings taught the upper grades. I went through the Primer in about 3 weeks. I promoted myself when it came to geography. Being in the same classroom with other students in the first, second, third, fourth grades—I believe the fourth grade was in the same room—I learned a lot by listening to the other students in the higher grades.

There was a geography book. I can remember it as though it were yesterday; it was Fries Geography. Well, I liked geography; I liked the maps and the pictures. So I went home one night and said to the man who raised me, a coal miner—he was my uncle by marriage—“I want a copy of Fries Geography. I like that book.” He said, “Well, we will go to Matoaka,” which was about 5 miles away. This was all in Mercer County, in southern West Virginia. “We will go to Matoaka on Saturday, which is pay day, and we will get Fries Geography.”

He took for granted that the teacher had asked me to ask him for this book. The teacher didn’t ask me to do that. I just decided I wanted it. So we caught the train and went to Matoaka. There was no highway up to Algonquin. Algonquin was the coal camp. There was no highway up to Algonquin from Matoaka.

The railroad ran across Clark’s Gap Mountain, and we went by railroad, a passenger train, from Matoaka up to Algonquin. We went by Giatto and Weyanoke in Mercer County. That is the way we went from Matoaka to Algonquin.

Mr. Byrd, the man who raised me, was a man who didn’t have much education. He probably never went to the second grade. He could barely read. We had a Holy Bible in our house. That was about the only book at our house. I always called him my dad because I loved him and he loved me. I didn’t know anybody else as a father. His wife was my aunt. She was my natural fa-

ther’s sister, and I had three brothers and a sister. But losing my mother when I was 1 year old, my biological father could not care for five children. That was back in the days when he probably earned only \$3 or \$4 a week working in a furniture shop.

Upon the death of my mother during the influenza epidemic, he gave the children to his sisters. He kept the one daughter. I only saw her when I was in high school—about 15 or 16 years old. I saw my sister then for the first and only time.

But there we were. These people who took me in to be raised loved me. They had one child prior to their taking me as their adopted child. That child had died of scarlet fever. So they had me as their adopted son. They loved me. I never knew about a mother’s kiss. My aunt was tough, very religious, and strict. I never knew a mother’s kiss, but she loved me.

Anyhow, I went home one evening, and I said to my dad—as I say, I called him my dad because, as far as I knew at that time, he was my father. Now, I went home and I said I had to have a Fries Geography. So on Saturday, we caught the passenger train, went down to Matoaka and bought Fries Geography.

I took it to school on Monday. The teacher Mrs. Carrico, said, “I didn’t tell you to get this.” I said, “Well, I have to have it and I want to study it.” That teacher let me keep that book and let me study along with the class in which the book was being taught.

Well, I came to love my teachers, and we had a category on that report card that was denominated “Department.” My old coal miner dad told me, “If you get a whipping in school, I will give you another whipping when you get home.” I wanted to please that coal miner dad, and I wanted to please those teachers. Back in those days, I say to Senator KENNEDY, the history book was by Muzzie.

It did not have a lot of pictures in it. It was full of narrative. I often ask the young pages who serve us—we have different pages from year to year to let me see their history book. I ask the students, the pages: Who is Nathan Hale? If an American history book does not tell us about Nathan Hale, I do not think it is much of a history book.

Who was Nathan Hale? Nathan Hale was a young schoolteacher, 21 years of age. When George Washington asked for a volunteer to go behind the British lines and spy on the British fortifications and bring back drawings of the British gun placements, and so on, this young man by the name of Nathan Hale, age 21, schoolteacher, volunteered to go.

He went behind the British lines. He accomplished his mission. On the night before he was to return to the American lines, he was arrested as a spy, and, of course, the drawings and the papers were in his clothing. The next morning, September 22, 1776, he was brought before a gallows, and as he

stood there with his hands tied behind him, he asked for a Bible. The request was refused. Nathan Hale stood there before the gallows, and only a few yards away was a wooden coffin—a wooden coffin. He knew that his body would soon be placed in that coffin.

He was asked by the British captain, whose name was Cunningham: Have you anything to say?

Nathan Hale said:

I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country.

Nathan Hale died for his country. I often wonder why people cannot give one vote for their country—whether they are Republicans or Democrats, why they will not vote, why they will not give one vote for their country. Nathan Hale gave the only life he had for his country.

That history book taught me about Nathan Hale. As a lad, I memorized my history lessons. I memorized them by the light of an oil lamp. I memorized history. I liked history. I liked to read about Francis Marion the "Swamp Fox," Nathanael Greene, Daniel Morgan, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison. They were my heroes.

So I say today we need good history books and good teachers so that the boys and girls today will find their heroes among the early Americans who built this country.

I came to appreciate the fact that the peoples of western Europe, eastern Europe, central Europe, southern Europe, northern Europe and elsewhere came to this country and helped to build it. My heroes were those men and women who were mentioned in the history books. The teaching of history is important.

When I moved out of that area of West Virginia—moved out with a wagon team—we moved up a hollow called Wolf Creek Hollow. We were 3 miles up that hollow.

I then attended another two-room school up on the mountain. I walked to that school with a man by the name of Archie Akers. He was one of the two teachers in the school. He would walk from 3 or 4 miles down the hollow up by my house, and I would get with him and walk on up to the top of that mountain to that school.

I had two teachers there. One was named Mary Grace Lilly. I remember the first day I went there. She said: If you have a fence and you can't get over it, you can't get under it, what do you do?

I held up my hand. She called on me. I was eager to be called on. I said: If you can't get over it, you can't get under it; you go around it.

She patted me on the head and said: That's right.

I memorized my lessons. Yes, memorized my lessons. I loved to do it. I loved to be called on by the teachers. I liked my teachers. I had good teachers. They did not get paid much. Very little did they get paid, but they were dedicated teachers.

We did not have any electricity in the house. We did not have any running

water. If we wanted to go to the toilet, we had to go outside to a privy behind the house. No radio. Never heard of television. You see, that was in the twenties.

I will never forget those books. Those history books, to a degree, shaped me to what I am today. They shaped me, they shaped my attitude, they shaped my outlook, and I came to want to be like James Madison or Webster or Clay or some other historical figure.

Oh, yes, I had my sports hero. That was Babe Ruth or Jack Dempsey—these are some years later. But history, history had an impact on me, may I say to my friend, Senator KENNEDY. It had a decided impact on me when I was just a boy, 8 years old, 9 years old, 10 years old, and was a root of my ambition to try to make something out of myself.

Mr. Byrd, who raised me, wanted me to go to school and to learn and to get a better education than he had been given. As I say, if he went to the second grade, I do not know that.

He did not want me to be a coal miner. He wanted me to get an education. And in those days, when I graduated from high school in 1934, it was something to have a high school education. I heard it said by my elders: If you don't get a high school education, you are not going to amount to much, you are going to have a hard time. You have to have a high school education.

We had great teachers, good high school teachers. W.J.B. Cormany, William Jennings Bryan Cormany, was the principal of the high school.

When we moved out of that hollow, Wolf Creek Hollow in Mercer County and moved to a coal camp, I enrolled at the Mark Twain School. The principal of that school, when he learned that I could recite whole chapters from the history book, took me up before the senior class and had me perform for the senior class. Well, that kind of enhanced my reputation around the school—to be able to go up before the senior class and recite history.

So, I loved my teachers. We were talking about teachers a minute ago. I often worked to be the best student in the class in order to please my teacher. David Reemsnyder, a huge man, when I was in junior high school, taught mathematics, Algebra, and geometry. I wanted to please him.

Mrs. W.J.B. Cormany taught music. I wanted to study the violin because she wanted me to study the violin.

That is the kind of influence teachers had on me. I always wanted to be the best student in the class, to please my teachers and to please that old coal miner dad who reared me. There is no way to establish the worth of a good teacher.

A Builder builded a temple,  
He wrought it with grace and skill;  
Pillars and groins and arches  
All fashioned to work his will.  
Men said, as they saw its beauty,  
"It shall never know decay;  
Great is thy skill, O Builder!  
Thy fame shall endure for aye."

A Teacher builded a temple  
With loving and infinite care,  
Planning each arch with patience,  
Laying each stone with prayer.  
None praised her unceasing efforts,  
None knew of her wondrous plan,  
For the temple the Teacher builded  
Was unseen by the eyes of man.

Gone is the Builder's temple,  
Crumpled into the dust;  
Low lies each stately pillar,  
Food for consuming rust.  
But the temple the Teacher builded  
Will last while the ages roll,  
For that beautiful unseen temple  
Was a child's immortal soul.

I have done a little reminiscing here today. The Senator I am most fond of saying is my favorite Senator on this side of the aisle, Senator KENNEDY—one gets into trouble saying things like that—saying "This man, this Senator, is my favorite," or, "that Senator is my favorite." They are all my favorites. But Senator KENNEDY is my favorite favorite Democratic Senator.

A few days ago, he wanted me to do a little reminiscing about my school days. You see, I have been going along life's pathway quite awhile. I came from those deep roots, and I like to speak of my remembrances of those teachers who sacrificed, back in the Depression. They couldn't get their checks cashed. They had to surrender 20 percent, sometimes, of the monthly check, the total check, in order to get it cashed. That was in the Great Depression.

Mr. President, my amendment to the budget resolution, as I have already indicated, will add \$100 million in fiscal year 2002 to function 550, education. This increased funding will allow for the continuation of an American history grant program I initiated last year. That program is going, it is ongoing, it is moving. This program is designed to promote the teaching of history, American history.

It is shocking—it is shocking—to read of students who do not know that the Civil War occurred during the second half of the 19th century. They cannot place the Civil War in a specific 50-year period with accuracy, let alone say it was from 1861 to 1865. They don't even know what half century it occurred in. So we are falling down badly in teaching American history. And history is so important.

Byron, Lord Byron, said, "History, with all her volumes vast, hath but one page," meaning that history repeats itself. And it does. It repeats itself.

When Adam and Eve were placed in the Garden of Eden, H<sub>2</sub>O was water. Water was made up of two atoms of hydrogen and one atom of oxygen. And it is still that way. It has never changed. It is still H<sub>2</sub>O.

It is the same with human nature. Human nature has never changed. Cain slew Abel, and men are still slaying their brothers. It has not changed. That is why we can truthfully say, and mean it, that history repeats itself—not in every precise and particular detail, but one needs to know history.

An unfortunate trend of blending history with a variety of other subjects to form a hybrid called "social studies" has taken hold in our schools. I am not against social studies, but I want history. If we are going to have social studies, that is OK, but let's have history. Further, the history books provided to our young people, all too frequently, gloss over the finer points of America's past. My amendment provides incentives to help spur a return to the teaching of traditional American history.

Every February our nation celebrates the birth of two of our most revered presidents—George Washington, the father of our country who victoriously led his ill-fitted assembly of militiamen against the armies of King George, and Abraham Lincoln, the eternal martyr of freedom, whose powerful voice and iron will shepherded a divided nation toward a more perfect Union. Sadly, I fear that many of our Nation's schoolchildren may never fully appreciate the lives and accomplishments of these two American giants of history. They have been robbed, the students have been robbed of that appreciation robbed by our schools that no longer stress a knowledge of American history, robbed by books that purport to be history books but are not history.

Study after study has shown that the historical significance of our Nation's grand celebrations of patriotism—such as Memorial Day or the Fourth of July—is lost on the majority of young Americans. What a waste. What a shame.

American students, regardless of race, religion, or gender, must know the history of the land to which they pledge allegiance. They should be taught about the Founding Fathers of this Nation, the battles that they fought, the ideals that they championed, and the enduring effects of their accomplishments. Without this knowledge, they cannot appreciate the hard won freedoms that are our birthright.

Our failure to insist that the words and actions of our forefathers be handed down from generation to generation will ultimately mean a failure to perpetuate this wonderful, glorious experiment in representative democracy. Without the lessons learned from the past, how can we insure that our Nation's core ideals—life, liberty, justice—will survive? As Marcus Tullius Cicero stated: ". . . to be ignorant of what occurred before you were born is to remain always a child."

Many groups are interested and have expressed support for this grant program. Representatives from the National Council for History Education, the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, the American Historical Association, and National History Day have all expressed enthusiasm for this grant program. They are very supportive of this effort.

So, for those reasons, I offer this amendment to the budget resolution to

increase function 500 (education) by \$100 million in fiscal year 2002, and I urge the adoption of it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, some few days ago when we were on the floor of the Senate—I think it was at that time, or perhaps even a little later in the week as we find ourselves today—we listened to our good friend from West Virginia. At that time he quoted one of his famous poems that, as his poem today suggests, had a deep-seated meaning to it. I took the occasion to ask him prior to the time that we were going to end this debate and discussion if he might recall his early years as a student and share them with us once again on the floor of the Senate.

I have had the good opportunity to listen to the good Senator speak on many, many different subject matters, and always with great enthusiasm, strength, and belief for the causes for which he speaks, so many of which I agree. I always find, having listened to him for many, many years, that the stories he talks about of his early years and the power of education is really a lesson that all of us should hear because it reminds all of us about what, in this case, this legislation is all about and what we are attempting to try to provide for the young people in this country.

If we were ever possibly able to sort of capture that extraordinary magic that was evidenced in that small school, the primer schools and then after that, and somehow develop in that classroom the atmosphere which brought BOB BYRD to sense the great desire and thirst for knowledge and personal achievement, accomplishment, and desire to really respond to the teachers by demonstrating keen intellect and an awareness in the classroom, and to take those early lessons and use them as guideposts for the rest of his life resulting in this extraordinary career of public service for the people of West Virginia, and the people of this Nation, I think our problems really as a country and as a society would be immensely advanced.

Whenever I listen to Senator BYRD, I think about what we were trying to do in terms of different paragraphs, different authorizations and approaches in what we were trying to do in different provisions of the legislation. It always makes us think about what we ought to be doing better to try to make the dream of education and the kind of opportunity this extraordinary Senator felt, which was so much a part of his pathway to his own life and such a source of strength to him, as well as his deep-seated faith—we would be very fortunate if we were ever able to sort of capture that in a legislative undertaking. We have not done so with this legislation, needless to say.

But we are going to continue to try to create a climate and atmosphere in

the schools so other Bob Byrds in West Virginia, Massachusetts, Vermont, and across this country might perhaps have a similar life's experience, and, as a result of that, we would have a better and a stronger nation.

I thank the Senator for his amendment. I know very well the Senator's strong interest in history.

I will just take a moment or two to remind the Senate that one of our great historians, David McCullough, will be releasing his wonderful book on Adams and Jefferson. The book is going to be published in about 2 weeks. They have already printed some 350,000 copies. I don't think they have underestimated both the success of the book or the thirst of Americans for knowledge about this country in its early years.

I remember the occasion when I was at the Longfellow House in Cambridge, MA, a few years back. I was looking at some of the papers in the Longfellow House. The Longfellow House was designated by Mrs. CLINTON under Saving America's Treasures as one of our two treasures. The Longfellow House in Cambridge and the Frelinghuysen Morris House in Lenox are other treasures. But this was a special treasure for a number of reasons.

One of those related to David McCullough's book is the fact that this was the place where George Washington assumed command of the American forces in the American Revolution. As David McCullough reminds us, this was the first symbol of national unity of a southern general commanding northern troops. Others had signed up for the American Revolution for periods of time, but the Glovers, which was a small band of troops who had been organized by Colonel Glover, committed themselves for the duration of the war.

They were subsequently enormously important because they were the ones who brought Washington from Brooklyn Heights over to New York when the British fleet came into New York Harbor at a very key time in 1776. And when the wind was blowing from the northeast, it kept the British troops out. The Glovers brought Washington back into the main of New York, which would be Manhattan now. And then he escaped out into southern New York State and eventually over to New Jersey. Then the Glovers were the ones who brought him across the river at Trenton.

But Dave McCullough wrote to me about papers that were there that were not as well cataloged or kept and were in danger of deterioration. These were magnificent handwritten notes of John Adams and John Quincy Adams that were directly relevant to the early years of the founding of this country. Senator BYRD was good enough to review—find out for himself, actually, as one would expect—the substance of that material and made his own independent judgment about the importance of preserving those in terms of

our national history. As a result of his efforts, some extraordinarily important early documents involving the founding of this country are now carefully preserved for future generations.

So when Senator BYRD talks about his love of history, we all know it and have seen it, but I think many of us have also witnessed it in our relationships with Senator BYRD on different issues.

I thank him for offering this amendment.

Some years ago, I was on the Bicentennial of the American Constitution committee. I was on that committee that Chief Justice Berger chaired with a number of our colleagues, Senator HATCH, Senator THURMOND—a number of our colleagues.

From that, which was the bicentennial of the Constitution, one enduring, continuing, and ongoing force from that period was the establishment of the Madison Fellows. And there are two schoolteachers from each State, each year, who are selected through a very rigorous selection process. They receive a stipend for a period of study and then basically commit to teach the Constitution for the rest of the time they are teaching. We have now two in each State of the Union.

We found during that period of time there was so little understanding about the Constitution. We found the challenge that we had so many people who could not read the Constitution. One of the small efforts that came out of that was a literacy corps to try to help in terms of reading.

We have seen a number of different efforts since that time. There are some important initiatives in this legislation to improve reading for the young people in this country. This was a serious deficiency. But I can just say, as we reviewed at that time the importance of developing knowledge about the Constitution, we saw, as well, the failure in too many of our schools of the understanding, the appreciation of being taught good history.

The good Senator's amendment can help immeasurably in developing a better understanding and awareness in history for our students.

I appreciate the way the amendment is structured as well because it gives some special effort to our neediest communities that perhaps do not have the range of different resources in terms of our history and gives them the recognition that they can participate in this program and be able to do so on a very even basis with any of the other communities in the country. So I think it is structured in a very compelling way as well.

I thank the Senator for both his statement and, most of all, for his earlier comments. I know every Member in this body is extremely busy, but if Americans want to know the value of an education and what it means in terms of an individual, read BOB BYRD, West Virginia, Thursday.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Massachusetts for this dialog. I was in this Chamber, I think it was probably a week ago, when there were similar circumstances, when the Senator from Massachusetts asked the Senator from West Virginia to bring together his memories of his childhood and the importance of history and the importance of a good education.

So I am pleased to have had the opportunity to hear the Senator speak. I wish more Members had the opportunity to be able to do that because it is a step back into history and a move forward in our ability to understand this great Nation of ours.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia so much for his efforts and for the amendment he has offered today.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I could say one final word, I particularly appreciate the reference the Senator from West Virginia made about his teachers and the names of his teachers. And Fryes, is that the geography book?

Mr. BYRD. Fryes.

Mr. KENNEDY. And the history book was—

Mr. BYRD. Muzzie.

Mr. KENNEDY. Muzzie. So I was glad to hear that.

I might just mention one of my great teachers was Arthur Holcombe, who wrote "Our More Perfect Union," who was probably the leading teacher—and certainly was at Harvard—about the Constitutional Convention. When he taught, you had a feeling you were right at the Constitutional Convention.

I was fortunate to have him the last year he taught at Harvard. He taught my father when he went to Harvard, and he taught my three brothers. He taught about the Constitutional Convention. So he had a pretty good grasp of the subject matter by that time. But it was also a course that made a profound impact and impression on me, and one I will never forget.

I thank again the Senator for his good words and his good work today.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Let me share another moment, too. When the Senator mentioned who his teachers were, I thought, let's see if I can remember my teachers. They were Miss Anderson, Miss Maughn, Miss Burns, Miss Brown, Miss Shipp, and then back to Miss Burns for the first six grades. I remember them just as if it were yesterday.

Mr. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. JEFFORDS. But it is amazing what influence teachers have on students, and others. The principal at the high school I went to was a good friend who was a real mentor to me, also.

So we have to do all we can to make sure every child in this country has the ability to get as good an education and have as wonderful teachers as we all had.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank both of my colleagues for their generous comments.

I sat and marveled, with great admiration, at the recollections that were expressed by Senator KENNEDY and at what he had to say today about some of the things that have happened in his great State as we try to contemplate the American Revolution, and then his comments concerning David McCullough; and his reference to John Adams.

Some few years ago I read John Adams' "Thoughts on Government." John Adams, I think, has been underestimated—or really has never been fully appreciated, as he should be.

During the Constitutional Convention, he had had his "Thoughts on Government" printed and had passed this work around among the members of the convention. It had a great impact on the members and influenced them very much in their deliberations.

I am glad that David McCullough, who is the right man for the job, is going to have this publication soon concerning John Adams, which leads me to say that knowing of David McCullough's interest in John Adams and knowing of John Adams' influence upon the Framers of the country, I have been interested in trying to get an appropriation for an appropriate monument to John Adams. I understand that David McCullough is also supporting and promoting that idea. I am very much for it.

I thank Senator KENNEDY for what he has said about John Quincy Adams. John Quincy Adams suffered a stroke on February 23, 1848, as he spoke in Statuary Hall. He was a vigorous opponent of America's entry and participation in the Mexican war. He was making this very emotional speech, and he had a stroke. He was taken to the office of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and died 2 days later—John Quincy Adams. He was elected to nine terms in the House, after having served as President.

Senator KENNEDY, we are not supposed to address each other in the first person in this body, but I want to tell you, I really enjoyed what you had to say. I am glad that you have such an appreciation of American history and the great patriots who gave us the Constitution. Senator KENNEDY is a student of history *sui generis*.

Mr. JEFFORDS. And an important part of history.

Mr. BYRD. I thank my friend, Mr. JEFFORDS, for his recollections of teachers. I remember a Miss McCone who taught history. And she asked me a question one day. I said: Huh? And I kept on studying. I was paying attention to my reading, and Miss McCone had not said another word. Next thing I knew, she had walked around the room and she came up behind me and gave me a resounding slap on the cheek and said: ROBERT, don't you ever say "huh" to me again.

I never said "huh" to Miss McCone again.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there is no further discussion of this

particular amendment, we are prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 402.

The amendment (No. 402) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I again thank both of the Senators.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, we have had a wonderful moment here, and I now would like to give the opportunity for others to come and give their moments if they so desire.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday, during rollcall vote No. 96, the Mikulski amendment, and No. 97, the McConnell amendment, as modified, I was necessarily absent to attend the funeral of a dear friend, Larry Cacciola, of Middletown, Connecticut.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" for each amendment.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

#### ENERGY AND CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, in the midst of the energy challenges facing our Nation lies a very unique opportunity. We have a chance to develop energy and environmental policies that work together. A clean environment and a strong energy policy need not be mutually exclusive. The forces of reality have brought us to this point. We have an energy problem that we cannot ignore. We also have a new administration which is re-evaluating our environmental policies, as any new administration would do, to ensure that what we are pursuing, and how we are pursuing it, is relevant, realistic, and achievable.

In the past, there has been a division of these issues. Energy and environmental policies have been considered separately—and mostly at odds with one another. This has led to an unnecessary gap of confidence in both efforts. We have an opportunity to reverse this division and create integrated policies to pursue both criti-

cally important objectives of a steady energy supply and a clean environment.

In the next few days, President Bush will release the administration's new energy policy. This policy will provide a balanced approach to meet the supply and demand imbalance we are now facing in this country. It will reflect our absolute need for a wide and deep energy supply portfolio, including the use of renewable energy and alternative energy sources. It would have been easy to defer this challenge, to delay the tough choices. But that's what got us into this mess. For the last 8 years, this country drifted without an energy policy, and today we are literally paying the price.

Gas prices have hit record levels and are predicted to continue rising. The energy shortages in California will spread to other areas of this country during the hot summer months when the demand for energy will continue to outstrip supply.

Finding solutions to problems requires bold ideas, common sense, imagination and sometimes unpopular choices. President Bush has shown courage and leadership for his willingness to address the problem and develop solutions. As we create a comprehensive and balanced policy to address our energy needs, we need to take into account our environmental priorities, particularly in the area of climate change.

Just one example of where we can do this is nuclear energy production. Like solar and wind power, nuclear power produces no greenhouse gases—zero emissions. It is one of the most cost effective, reliable, available, and efficient forms of energy we have. Vast improvements in technology have made it one of the safest forms of energy production. Having nuclear energy play a vital role in our energy policy will enhance not only our energy supply but our environmental health as well.

President Bush has assembled a cabinet level environmental task force to review climate change. They have been listening to and learning from some of the world's foremost meteorologists, climatologists, physicists, scientists, and environmental experts. The President has said that his administration will offer a science based, realistic, and achievable alternative to the Kyoto protocol.

That is the responsible thing to do. President Bush merely stated the obvious when he declared the Kyoto protocol dead. Although his actions have been criticized, the forthrightness and clarity are refreshing on this issue. The Kyoto protocol would never have been in a position to be ratified by the U.S. Senate. The Clinton-Gore administration knew this as well. That is why they never submitted the treaty to the Senate even for debate and consideration.

Despite the heated rhetoric on this issue from the other side of the Atlan-

tic, no major industrialized nation has ratified the Kyoto protocol. In fact, Australia has said it will follow in rejecting the treaty. There is a reason for that. The Kyoto protocol would not work. It left out 134 nations, some of whom are among the world's largest emitters of greenhouse gases. A treaty claiming to attempt to reduce global emissions of greenhouse gases has no chance of being effective when it exempts some of the largest greenhouse gas emitters in the world—nations like China, India, South Korea, Brazil, and 130 other nations.

My colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, whom I worked with in 1997 on S. Res. 98, addressed this point last week. S. Res. 98, or the Byrd-Hagel resolution, which the Senate agreed to by a vote of 95 to 0, stated that the United States should not agree to any treaty in Kyoto, or thereafter, which would place binding limits on the United States and other industrialized nations unless "the protocol or other agreement also mandates new specifically scheduled commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions for Developing Country Parties within the same compliance period." As Senator BYRD reiterated last week, developing countries must be included in any international agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions.

From the moment it was signed, the Kyoto protocol was never a realistic or achievable way to move forward on climate change. In the meantime, we've lost precious time when we could have been exploring achievable and realistic ways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We have an opportunity now to discard an unworkable protocol and build a new consensus that will address climate change, and initiate efforts that are realistic and achievable.

The United States is still a party to the Framework Convention on Climate Change (Rio Treaty), which was signed by the United States and ratified by the U.S. Senate in 1992. We should go back to the framework of that treaty, before the Berlin Mandate that excluded developing countries from participation, and lay the groundwork for future international efforts. This gives us a strong base to work from. Many of the discussions during the negotiations for the Kyoto protocol have worked to build consensus on areas that will need to be part of any international initiative—flexible measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the role of carbon sinks, and other areas. We can build on this progress in developing an alternative to Kyoto.

If we are creative and if our partners will work with us in good faith, we can negotiate arrangements that are responsible and proactive. By addressing this issue domestically, the United States can demonstrate our commitment to climate change and show that meeting this challenge can be done in an integrated way that ensures a sound energy supply and economic stability. The world will not be better off if the