

I remember the chairman, Mr. HOLLINGS, saying, I've never heard of anything like that. It was pretty obvious we were going to have to go to a vote. He didn't know if he had enough votes to defeat it and I didn't know if I had enough votes to pass it. An instance such as that calls for a little backroom sit-down, talk about this, and see what it does to the issue.

I was right there with him. Senator INOUE from Hawaii was also in the meeting. One can start to learn the ways of the Senate especially in the areas of committee work.

I will miss ERNEST HOLLINGS because he has been an institution here serving from the 89th through the 108th Congress. That is a great tradition.

The Presiding Officer knows and understands ERNEST HOLLINGS. We may disagree on philosophy but we did not disagree on America.

DON NICKLES will leave this Senate in this year, having arrived in 1980 with President Ronald Reagan. The real voice of conservatism, a fiscal conservative, who stood in this Senate and fought wasteful spending and did it with grace, did it with knowledge, a leader among all.

There again, he being 8 years ahead of me, he was a mentor and someone I could look to, study and learn from.

In 1987 or 1986, TOM DASCHLE came to the Senate. A neighbor from South Dakota from Aberdeen, SD, we both learned a little bit here. He was much more successful than I, reaching into leadership of his party. We had a lot of common friends in South Dakota. I will be sorry to see TOM DASCHLE leave the Senate. But he has left big tracks here. There are fond memories on issues that we agreed on and issues that we did not agree, but we did not do it being disagreeable.

BOB GRAHAM from Florida I learned was in the Angus business and he leaves this year.

JOHN BREAUX from Louisiana. I worked with him on the Commerce Committee regarding energy issues. His wisdom will be missed.

I am afraid I took much more from these men than I could ever return to them.

I served only one term with JOHN EDWARDS and PETER FITZGERALD. They, too, will be missed in the Senate. Their contribution was huge.

BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL served from the 103rd to the 108th Congress. But my, the knowledge he has had and the experiences he has had.

It seems as if he has always ridden dangerous things, including old broncs and horses, which are unpredictable, and, you might say, not the safest things. What a great thrill being the cover Senator for Harley Davidson. He, too, has lived a great life. He, too, understands the West. He is also a member of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe. The reservation is in my State of Montana.

We campaigned together, learned from each other. Now he will be return-

ing back to his Colorado, back to the High Country. He is looking forward to that.

PETER FITZGERALD comes from Illinois. As to all of these men, I want to say you do form relationships here, and there is a certain bond that attracts us all, as we learn that even though you may be on the same side of the aisle or the opposite side of the aisle, one could always agree or disagree without being disagreeable. That is what makes the Senate a special place.

We will miss all of these men, but I am looking forward to those who take their place as, there again, new relationships will be developed, a new bond dealing with the old challenges of a free society, with those who love the Constitution and love this country who were prepared to die for it and would if asked to do so today. No one doubts the depth of their patriotism nor their service to their country. We welcome them as we say goodbye to old friends, old relationships that will never be forgotten.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and 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. ALEXANDER. 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. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to ten minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

1989 EDUCATION SUMMIT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, right after the election, on November 3, 2004, I went to the Miller Center at the University of Virginia. The purpose of the occasion was a discussion of the 1989 Education Summit. It had been 15 years since the President of the United States and the Nation's Governors—all of our chief executives—gathered in Charlottesville, VA, to establish the first ever national education goals for our country.

It is astonishing to me that 15 years have gone by since then, and it was to most other governors who were there. It was important to look back on what had happened in 1989, to see how it happened, and to think about what happened since then.

The summit at the University of Virginia had gone remarkably well. President George H.W. Bush had convened it. Terry Bransted, the Governor of Iowa, was chairman of the National Governors Association that year. He had appointed the Governor from Arkansas, Bill Clinton, whose library is opening today, and Carroll Campbell of South Carolina as the lead Governors. Working with the President's rep-

resentatives, they came up with those first national education goals. There had been a long prelude to all of this activity in 1989. I was a part of that prelude, and I saw a lot of it happen.

In 1978, when I was elected Governor and Bill Clinton was elected Governor of Arkansas, and Dick Riley of South Carolina, and our colleague, BOB GRAHAM, who was Governor of Florida, we were all faced with the same issues. Our States were behind; the world was changing, and we needed a better education system, particularly at the elementary and secondary level. So that by 1983, when the report of the U.S. Department of Education, called "A Nation at Risk," came out saying we were greatly at risk because of the mediocrity of the education system, it was into that environment that it came.

The Governors in 1985 and 1986 all worked for a year on education. I was chairman of the NGA that year, and Bill Clinton was the vice chairman. It was the first time in the history of the governors organization that we all focused for a year on one subject. Then, by 1989, we had a President of the United States, George H.W. Bush, who became the first of three consecutive Presidents to say he wanted to be an education President. The goals that the governors adopted with the President in 1989 were very straightforward.

No. 1, all children in America will start school ready to learn.

No. 2, high school graduates will increase to 90 percent.

No. 3, American students will leave the fourth, eighth, and twelfth grades having demonstrated competency in math, science, English, history, and geography.

No. 4, America would be first in the world in math and science.

No. 5, adult Americans would be literate.

No. 6, every school would be free of drugs and violence.

Those were the goals. You might say after a decade of unprecedented school reform and concern, America backed into its goals for reform. That was 15 years ago. A lot has happened since then.

When I became Education Secretary in 1991, we created something called America 2000, which was to try to move America community by community toward those national education goals. Governor Clinton became President Clinton, and he changed the name to Goals 2000 and tried his brand of moving us in that direction.

Now we have another President, the son of the man for whom I worked, who has, through No Child Left Behind, working in a bipartisan way, tried to set from Washington accountability standards that will help make sure that all children are learning. I rise to talk about this today only for this reason: That the national summit of governors and the President, on its 15th anniversary, should not go by without mentioning it on this floor.

There has never been anything like it before. One of the most important

parts of it was that members of Congress were not involved. A lot of members of Congress—it was a Democratic legislature at that time—were not very happy about that. But I think that was the correct decision because, in my view, elementary and secondary education is a national concern, central to almost everything important that we do, but it is not necessarily a Federal Government concern.

The fact that the governors and the President, the chief executives of our country, met together to establish these goals and begin to move us toward those goals was, I think, the correct way to do that.

I would like to salute the University of Virginia's Miller Center for holding this celebration. It included former Education Secretary Dick Riley, Rod Paige, the current Education Secretary, and I was there as well. It also included JOHN SUNUNU, a former Governor of New Hampshire, who was at the education summit and who was Chief of Staff at the White House at the time it was organized, and Jerry Baliles, the former Governor of Virginia, who was Governor of Virginia at the time the education summit was held.

I thought Governor Baliles' remarks were especially interesting and useful. He talked about the political context of the times and how the governors were able to do this without interference from Congressmen and Senators in Washington, DC. He talked about the competitiveness of our country and the world, and how we are driven to realize that better schools meant better jobs and that most of our standard of living depends upon the research, the inventions, and technology that we have at our great system of colleges and universities in the world. And, he talked about where we had come in the last 15 years.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD, following my remarks, the full remarks of the Honorable Gerald L. Baliles, the former Governor of Virginia, which he made at the Miller Center of Public Affairs and the Curry School of Education in Charlottesville on November 4, 2004.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I think it is worthwhile, in addition to this, to give a little credit to former President George H.W. Bush. I still believe that when the dust settles and history books are written, President Bush's leadership in education will be among his most significant and lasting contributions.

His tour of duty was interrupted by the voters in 1992, so he was not able to finish the job. But his America 2000 community effort had a variety of initiatives which set the agenda for American education in the 1990s. They included a new set of national standards in core curriculum subjects, including science, history, English, geography,

arts, civics, and foreign languages. It included a national voluntary examination system geared to those new standards. They included new generation, thousands of start-from-scratch, "break-the-mold schools." We call them today charter schools, but then there were only perhaps ten such charter schools. It included giving teachers more autonomy and flexibility in their classrooms by waiving federal rules and regulations, something Congress eventually did more of later. It also included a GI bill for children, to give middle and low-income families \$1,000 scholarships to spend at any lawfully operated school of their choice, thereby giving those parents more of the same choices that wealthy parents already had.

That was an excellent agenda in the early 1990s. It is still a good agenda today. The summit on education, the national education goals created in 1989, need to be remembered, and so does the leadership of President George W. Bush on education.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

THE REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE GERALD L. BALILES, FORMER GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA AND PARTNER, HUNTON & WILLIAMS, BEFORE THE MILLER CENTER OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND THE CURRY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA, NOVEMBER 4, 2004

THE 1989 EDUCATION SUMMIT: A REEVALUATION

At the beginning of the 1992 Vice Presidential debate, Ross Perot's running mate, Admiral Stockdale, opened the debate by looking into the camera and saying, "Who am I and why am I here?"

Today, I am here because 15 years ago I, along with the rest of the nation's governors, met with the first President Bush and his cabinet for an unprecedented Education Summit here at the University of Virginia.

I am a strong believer in the importance of context; in the notion that to truly understand an event or a series of events, one must understand the times in which those events occurred. And that is my role here today.

The agenda is filled with Education Secretaries, educators and others who have played a critical role in how the results of the Summit were implemented. They have been on the front lines of education in the fifteen years since the Summit, while I retired from public office just three and-a-half months after the Summit's conclusion. I look forward to their assessments of the progress made and the challenges that confront us.

I believe that former New Hampshire Governor and White House Chief of Staff John Sununu and I are the only ones here who actually attended the Summit, and all of its meetings, as principal participants. So it is that the Miller Center has asked me to provide some context, to discuss what was going on at the time, why the meeting was held, what battles were going on behind the scenes, and what our expectations were for the Summit.

I am delighted to be here today to share the program with Governor Warner, Secretary Paige and so many others who have advanced the cause of education in our country.

I just mentioned John Sununu. I served as Vice Chair of the National Governors Association under John and then succeeded him as Chairman. Not long after that, John

joined President Bush in Washington as his Chief of Staff. One of the best things about that 1989 summit was the opportunity to see and work with John again, and I am delighted he is here today for this retrospective event.

It is also a pleasure to be here with my former colleagues Dick Riley and Lamar Alexander. I remember well my first National Governors' Association Meeting, in August, 1986, hosted by Governor Dick Riley at Hilton Head, South Carolina and chaired by a Tennessee Governor named Lamar Alexander. The major theme of the meeting was education; the NGA had done a great deal of work on education reform during Governor Alexander's chairmanship and the results were being released.

Lamar Alexander and Dick Riley, through their work as Governors and later as U.S. Secretaries of Education, have done more than any two people I can think of to advance the cause of quality education in the United States over the past quarter century. We all owe them a tremendous debt.

Now to the task at hand.

You might recall that the 1989 Summit was greeted with equal measures of anticipation and cynicism, hope and skepticism. Many noted at the time that Americans periodically make brave and impressive noises about education, but that we frequently fail to achieve the necessary breakthroughs to give education the priority it merits.

No question, some expected the Charlottesville Summit to be little more than a variation on disappointing earlier efforts. But others—and I counted myself among them—believed that something different and important could happen here, something which might foretell a favorable turning point in our national commitment to education.

The day before leaving Richmond to come to Charlottesville for the Summit, I made the following observation at a press conference: "While it seems unlikely to me that fundamental solutions to the problems of education will emerge out of a meeting that will last little more than 24 hours, the Summit could well be the start of a significant national effort."

Fifteen years later, I believe the Summit was not only the start of a significant national effort, but in many ways was a seminal event; nationalizing the importance of educational policy, sharpening the focus on results, and making executive political leadership more important.

To understand why, and to understand the context in which the Summit was held, I want to focus on three factors in particular:

First, I want to focus on the political context of the time. Much of the media and public reaction to the Summit centered around political questions—especially in the days leading up to the Summit. How much of the Summit was designed to cater to the President's political needs? How did Congress view the Summit? What did the Governors expect? What tensions existed between the different levels of government? Those questions were being posed at the time, and it is important to examine them.

Second, I want to look at the substantive context of the time. There was consensus across the political spectrum in 1989 that the United States faced a challenge, almost a crisis, of international competitiveness. While people of various political stripes disagreed sharply on specific remedies, it had become conventional wisdom that, by a variety of international measures, including educational achievement, the United States was not as competitive as most of its trading partners and competitors in the global economy, and was falling further behind. This may be difficult to comprehend today, but the fact is that the competitiveness issue

permeated most political debates of that time, and much of the educational reform effort in the Nation was fueled by competitiveness concerns.

Finally, I want to look at the debate over the Federal role in education. In 1989, the very idea of a Federal role in education was still an open question. Today, we largely argue over what form the Federal role should take and how much it will cost. Very few will question the Federal role. We do not challenge the need for national standards or a national approach to educational policy. Back then, things were quite different, and the Summit played a major role—perhaps THE major role—in settling the basic question of whether there should be a Federal role in education.

I want to focus on those three factors of politics, competitiveness and the Federal educational role because they really laid the foundation for much of what has followed, both at the State and Federal levels. And, yes, that includes Virginia's "Standards of Learning" and the Federal "No Child Left Behind" legislation.

POLITICS

Let's begin with the political dimension.

It is well known that during the 1988 campaign, the then-Vice President Bush had proclaimed that he'd like to be known as the "Education President." There was a belief, I think, that this would not only allow him to compete for voters the Democratic nominee was taking for granted, but that it would also allow the Vice President to set himself apart from President Reagan whose rhetoric and budgets, especially in the early years, demonstrated opposition to Federal involvement in education.

If that was President Bush's strategy, it worked. His opponent in 1988, Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis, took the education issue somewhat for granted and the Vice President was able to use it to his advantage. For those who feared a replay of Reagan-era proposals to eliminate the Department of Education, the new President's words assuaged their worries.

When President Bush talked of a "kinder, gentler" administration, many believed that he was talking about education. Yet, when President Bush went on to observe, in his inaugural address, that the U.S. Government had "more will than wallet" in the face of mounting needs AND mounting deficits, many worried that he would walk away from his commitment to education.

Indeed, the first several months of the Bush administration saw little or no action in the education area. This was understandable. A new administration was getting organized, momentous things were beginning to happen in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and pro democracy demonstrators spent the spring of that year camped out in Tianamen Square in Beijing.

In addition, hostages were being taken in the Middle East. The budget deficit was increasing rapidly. There were many serious international priorities. That nothing was happening on education should not have been a surprise, though the fact did give rise to some grumbling and increased pressure on the Bush Administration to do something.

When President Bush came to Chicago in August, 1989 to address the annual meeting of the National Governors Association, there was much to talk about—in fact, the major story in the news the day he visited concerned the death of a U.S. hostage taken in the Middle East.

Indeed, the President broke the news of the hostage's death to the public at the beginning of his speech to the Governors. But during the course of his remarks, he announced that he would meet with the Governors in a

"Summit" sometime that fall to discuss education. It would be only the third time a President would meet in a specially-called, Summit-type, meeting with Governors, and the first time that the subject would be education. The exact time and place had not then been determined, nor had the University of Virginia been selected as the site of the Summit.

Naturally, there were pundits who believed that the meeting would be nothing more than a photo opportunity; a chance for the President to quiet criticism of himself for not spending as much time on education as some people wanted. It was summertime, Congress was out of session, and after the National Governors' Association meeting there was little hard news for the press to focus on, at least in the domestic arena. So, people were free to speculate about the President's motives for holding the Summit, and about the agenda for the meeting.

About two weeks after the President had proposed the meeting, the White House announced that the Summit would be held here at the University of Virginia, and that it would be held at the end of September, about a month later. The fact that we now had a specific set of dates, and a location, only raised the intensity of the debate, as well as the political temperature.

To begin with, Congress was unhappy about being excluded from the discussion. Up until 1989, Federal education policy was primarily a congressional concern. Presidents might express opinions but otherwise were reduced mostly to signing bills passed by Congress. Here was a President who had proposed to alter that balance, who made it clear that the Summit was limited to himself and the 50 State Governors and the Governors of the territories.

Congressional leaders, particularly the chairmen of the education committees, were outraged—and not just at the President. Relations between Congress and the Governors were a little frayed at the time, particularly between Democratic Governors and Democratic members of Congress.

At that Chicago NGA meeting that I chaired, 49 of the 50 Governors signed a letter to congressional leaders asking for a moratorium on new Medicaid mandates. Continued expansion of Medicaid was exacting a major toll on State budgets around the country, and the Governors were asking for a brief moratorium on new mandates in order to find ways to fully fund what was already in the pipeline.

Congressional leaders were incensed. Congressman Henry Waxman, who chaired the subcommittee in charge of Medicaid, wrote to all Democratic Governors accusing them of a variety of sins for their position in support of a moratorium on new Medicaid mandates. Things were especially tense between the gubernatorial wing of the Democratic party and the congressional wing (in those days, Democrats controlled both houses of Congress).

So, there was the fear that congressional prerogatives were being stripped away and anger at Governors, particularly Democratic Governors, for being complicit in upsetting this balance.

Congressional leaders found an ally in the then-Governor of New York, Mario Cuomo. Governor Cuomo, who was also the only Governor not to sign the Medicaid mandate letter, began working with Senator Kennedy, Chairman of the Senate Human Resources Committee, and Congressman Hawkins, his House counterpart. They wanted Congressional leaders to participate in the Summit since Congress would have to fund any Federal initiatives, and they were also urging Democratic Governors to go to the Summit with an agenda demanding full Federal fund-

ing of a variety of programs, and the creation of several new Federal programs as well.

Many of the Democratic Governors believed this approach to be misguided, that if the Governors' conversation with the President on education simply mirrored Washington's fights over formulas and funding, then the public would view the meeting skeptically, and we would lose an important opportunity to articulate a national commitment to education.

Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton was the Lead Democratic Governor for Education, and he and I worked together to convince our Democratic gubernatorial colleagues of this point of view. It was a difficult challenge and the outcome was uncertain. Attempts were made by some to convince individual Democratic Governors, and their staffs, that the Summit was a clever trap devised by the administration to ensure that no new resources would go into education.

In the end, we convinced most of the Democratic Governors that the best way forward was an approach that focused on a set of challenging goals and standards; stringent enough that the goals could not be reached without a major financial commitment at all levels of government.

We believed that if we just asked for more money, we would lose the public debate; that people would not support money divorced from results; that both needed to go hand-in-hand.

We believed, in short, that the best way to obtain additional resources for education was to set goals that could not be achieved without those new resources.

So, if one is looking for a reason why the major result of the Summit was a commitment to develop national goals, this is a good place to start.

In the meantime, the Republicans were having their own discussions. Most of them also revolved around funding, with the administration being wary of calls simply to provide more Federal money. Congressional Republicans largely agreed with the new administration in opposing more money, with some even wanting to make cuts in education spending. Republican Governors wanted to be supportive of their President in holding the line against demands for major new cash infusions, but they also realized that more resources were required. Some of the most conservative Republicans were concerned that the Summit would all but enshrine a Federal role in education that they opposed.

In the end, Republican Governors came to a very similar conclusion as their Democratic counterparts—that national goals would be the best way forward. My impression was that they were under much less pressure from their congressional counterparts than the Democratic Governors were from congressional Democrats; the pressure Republican Governors faced came more from an administration not wanting to be pressured into major new infusions of Federal money. But Governors of both parties ultimately came to similar conclusions prior to the Summit.

In today's partisan political climate, this bipartisan consensus seems almost impossible to believe. There were many reasons for this bipartisan convergence in thinking.

Perhaps it is because Governors have always been—or at least were then—better able to work across Party lines than members of Congress.

Perhaps it is because Governor Clinton and South Carolina Governor Carroll Campbell, who was the Lead Republican Governor for Education, got along so well or because Iowa Governor Terry Brandstad and Washington Governor Booth Gardner, the new Chairman

and Vice Chairman respectively, of the National Governors Association got along so well, or because we all got along with John Sununu, who as White House Chief of Staff played a major role in Summit preparations. Who knows?

The fact is, however, that the political needs and desires of both Democratic and Republican Governors happened to coincide in an important way at that time, and the Governors went in to the Summit pretty much united over the need for fairly aggressive national goals. It was, to resurrect a phrase, a time of harmonic convergence.

And what about the White House? As I mentioned earlier, the main political worry from the White House was that the Summit would lead to intense pressure for a major infusion of new Federal dollars. I remember, very specifically, that this was the one non-negotiable demand from the White House—the Summit would not be allowed to focus solely on discussions of new Federal money.

Some on the White House staff wanted little more than a statement saying that the President and Governors shared a common commitment to education. Others believed that such a result would be seen as inadequate and would merely confirm the suspicion many had that the entire Summit was pure politics.

I want to state, by the way, that my belief has always been that President Bush was sincere in his desire to chart a new way forward in education. This view was confirmed by what I observed at the Summit and by conversations I had with the President in the months and years after the Summit—including a visit to Camp David a couple of years later. In this, he had the effective assistance of John Sununu and, later, Lamar Alexander. But there were some in the administration in September, 1989, who advocated a minimalist approach, to say the least.

But others at the White House, echoing the President, believed that we had the opportunity to achieve more than a “Mom and Apple Pie” joint statement on the value of education. They were no more interested in committing the administration to major new Federal spending than the minimalists, but they did believe that we had a golden opportunity to focus the country’s attention on the need for a shared national goal of education excellence.

Thus was the consensus born that the Summit would attempt to articulate a set of national educational goals, or at least begin a process in which such goals could be developed.

So, yes, politics was critically important to how the Summit unfolded and concluded. But as my UVA friend Larry Sabato likes to say, “politics is a good thing.” And in this case, politics led to a shared approach and a constructive outcome for educational reform.

COMPETITIVENESS

Let me turn now to my second point, the substantive international policy concerns of late 1989.

It is hard to remember now, with most of Europe and Japan stuck in a decade-long economic funk, but in the late 1980’s the major issue hanging over the education debate—permeating debates over everything in fact—was competitiveness. At the time, the best way to get attention for one’s issue was to link it to the effort to make the American economy more competitive on a global basis. The book shelves were filled with tomes written by academics, journalists, politicians, sports coaches and others about competitiveness.

Education was a major issue affected by the competitiveness debate. The changes that so challenged the Nation—the changes

that inspired the Education Summit—were as much external as they were internal. And they were viewed as quite real, even threatening.

The case for viewing education in this light was first made with the 1983 publication of “A Nation at Risk.” That report completely transformed the education reform issue; it began to nationalize the issue, and it placed education firmly in the middle of the competitiveness debate.

Listen to the language in the opening paragraphs of that report: “[America’s] once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world. . . . [T]he educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and as a people. . . . We have, in effect, been committing an act of unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament.”

Tough stuff. Of course, the intent of the words was to jolt the public, the press and our political institutions out of their complacency and remove the inertia of the status quo. The fact that the report came from a panel created by President Reagan’s Secretary of Education, Terrell Bell, made the words all the more powerful.

Well, if the intent was to jolt, it worked. Within just one year of the report’s release, 41 States had toughened high school graduation requirements in line with the report’s recommendations. Thirty-five States had raised teacher certification standards, twenty States had increased instructional time and nineteen had improved school discipline policies.

In 1986, the National Governors’ Association released “A Time for Results.” This report proposed a series of actions to be completed by 1991—to strengthen teaching, increase the use of technology and raise the level of local educational standards. This report was to be updated each year in a series called “Results in Education.”

Also in 1986, the Southern Governors Association Advisory Council on International Education released a report calling for improvements in the teaching of languages, geography and other international subjects. The report stated: “By every measure, Americans are not prepared to compete and to participate in the international marketplace.” The report continued: “We, as a nation, as constantly surprised by world political and economic events. They occur in places we never heard of, for reasons we do not understand.” The title of the report?

CORNERSTONE OF COMPETITION

In 1987, the National Governors Association launched a year-long initiative called “Jobs, Growth and Competition” which focused on a variety of issues, including education, that were deemed important to improving our international competitiveness. In 1989, the National Governors’ Association launched an initiative during my chairmanship called “America in Transition, the International Frontier.” The final report was entitled “A Competitive Nation.” A series of earlier reports had focused on a variety of issues, including education.

But, this competitiveness concern wasn’t just for Governors. Congress and the President got in on the act as well.

Congress created the Competitiveness Policy Council and charged it with reporting yearly on a series of actions that the nation could take to enhance its competitiveness in transportation, technology, trade, fiscal policy and education.

The White House created a Competitiveness Council, chaired by the Vice President. So, this topic was a concern at every level of government.

At the 1989 Education Summit’s opening press conference, I noted that: “We increasingly cannot compete with overseas nations. . . . The problem is that successful state and local programs are not enough; we need national educational excellence, and a national commitment to obtain it.”

So, the competitiveness issue permeated the political landscape, it impacted everything else. There was consensus across the land that we had a “competitiveness problem” and education was a part of that problem—and solution.

What did this mean?

It meant that education could no longer be strictly a local or state issue. For if we had a national problem of competitiveness, then we needed national solutions. We could not leave it to chance that every State and locality would properly educate their young people; after all, our competitors had not. We needed a national conversation about education, we needed national results. We needed—voilà—national goals, just like our competitors had. That’s why the Joint Statement issued by the President and Governors at the conclusion of the Summit began with these words: “The President and the nation’s Governors agree that a better educated citizenry is the key to the continued growth and prosperity of the United States. . . . Education has always been important, but never this important because the stakes have changed: Our competitors for opportunity are also working to educate their people. As they continue to improve, they make the future a moving target.”

And in the introduction to the National Education Goals agreed to five months later by the President and the Governors, you will find these words: “America’s educational performance must be second to none in the 21st century. Education is central to our quality of life. It is at the heart of our economic strength and security, our creativity in the arts and letters, our invention in the sciences, and the perpetuation of our cultural values. Education is the key to America’s international competitiveness.”

The need to fit education into a national competitiveness strategy, combined with the political conclusions arrived at by Governors of both parties and the White House, forced a focus on national goals as the way forward.

FEDERAL ROLE

Finally, let me focus on my third point: the concern in 1989 over Federal involvement in education.

If the political mood and economic imperative seemed to be converging on the idea of national education goals, there was still an unease many people felt about Federal involvement in education. This had been the subject of considerable debate a decade earlier when the U.S. Department of Education was created during the Carter Administration. It was the topic of campaign rhetoric on the campaign trail in 1980, and it was certainly argued in the halls of Congress on an annual basis in the early to mid-1980’s when President Reagan proposed eliminating the department in his proposed budgets.

Among those most uncomfortable with the idea of an Education Summit were those who were ideologically opposed to the very idea of Federal involvement in education. Many writers, including William Safire, warned explicitly that the Bush Administration was setting the stage for a large expansion of the Federal role in education and for nationalizing the issue.

They were right.

In fact, I would argue that the major achievement of the 1989 Education Summit was to settle, once and for all, the argument over a Federal role in education; whether education would be a national issue. The

President and the Governors, by agreeing to the need for national education goals and agreeing on a strategy for developing those goals, had agreed upon a framework. There WOULD be a Federal role; education WOULD be a national issue, addressed with national solutions.

It meant that educational decisions would no longer be settled solely at the local level. It meant that legislative deliberations at the State and Federal levels would become relatively less important, and executive decision and vision relatively more important. That's what happens when results are required; when speeches, money and programs are just not enough.

This all seems like conventional wisdom today, but we can easily forget it was not always so. The 1989 Summit had a real impact, far beyond the imagining of those of us privileged enough to have participated. It fundamentally changed the balance of political power on education issues, and it nationalized education policy in a way few would have conceived just a few years earlier.

CONCLUSION

When the President called for a Summit with the Nation's Governors to discuss education, many observers may not have known what to expect. I don't recall any of the Governors believing beforehand that, while we agreed on the need for national goals, we would settle the argument over Federal involvement in education, or that we would shift the Federal focus on education from one end of Pennsylvania Avenue to the other.

I do recall a great deal of skepticism and criticism from outside observers, especially Congress and the press. But I do not recall anything but the most constructive attitude being expressed by any of the principal participants. And, by the way, this was a meeting of principals, very few staff aides were permitted much of a role at all.

It is worth noting, by the way, that the participants—despite all of the good will and convergence of thinking on the value of setting national goals—did not settle on specific goals at the Summit. We agreed on the need for goals, and, in general, what those goals should address. The actual goals themselves, however, were not developed until several months later.

But, for the first time, the President and Governors were discussing on a national level a series of important questions. Many of these had long been discussed and debated in the States, and particularly in the Southern Regional Education Board states. These questions included, among others:

Intervention: Could we do a better job of preparing children for first grade?

Dropout rates: Could we slow the tide?

Adult literacy: Could we put a dent in it, even eliminate it?

Teacher quality: Could we motivate and inspire it?

Decentralized management: Could it produce better results?

And, parental choice: Could this be a workable technique or just the latest fad?

In the end, it was a focus on such questions that formed the basis of the goals and the national education policy that we know today.

I believe the Education Summit was, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, the "beginning of a new beginning" in education policy. I believe the way we think, as a Nation, about the goals and objectives of education began to change in September, 1989. Unsurprisingly, we did not find all the answers at the Summit. But we were asking the right questions—and for the first time, we were asking them as a Nation.

In one sense, this should not have been all that surprising, because throughout our na-

tional history, educational reform has been a vital and characteristic part of the American impulse. We have always believed that we can, by the force of our own imagination and determination, improve tomorrow by improving ourselves and our children.

But, never has it been more important that our traditional convictions give rise to deliberate action.

If ignorance is the enemy of democracy, in an international economy, ignorance could well be an invitation to national decline. In 1989, it was clear and apparent that the time had arrived for us to put ourselves on the spot. That was the message I heard in Charlottesville.

Accountability and the measurement of student performance, we declared, must be an integral part of our educational process. Indeed, Charlottesville portended a significant shift in our approach to education: From here on, we said that we are going to be increasingly measured by more than the resources we invest. Instead, we declared that we are going to be questioned and examined on the progress our students achieve—or fail to achieve.

Frankly, I think that is how it should be—for there is too much at stake for it to be otherwise.

In 1989, the President and the governors joined efforts to ensure that America becomes a Nation resolved to using education as the best means for shaping the future. The reason we are here today is to assess our national performance since 1989. Where are the benchmarks of progress? Where are the guideposts for confronting the challenges?

Our speakers and panelists today are here to help us make those assessments. I share your interest in their opinions of how far we have come, and I am confident that they will focus our attention on the significant challenges at hand.

Today, as in 1989, we recognize that we have a lot of work to do, and we should always keep in perspective that all of our educational goals, commitments and resources come down to two fundamental points:

First, education's role as a transmitter of civilization's knowledge and values must not be diminished. It is part of the glue that binds together the fabric of our society.

Second, education is, also, increasingly, the engine that drives the American economy—our economic future depends upon our ability to compete, but our ability to compete depends upon our ability to educate. It is just that simple.

Thank you. I look forward to the rest of the Conference.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBLISS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and I be recognized to speak in morning business.

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

TRIBUTES TO RETIRING SENATORS

TOM DASCHLE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I rise to bid official farewell to one of my best friends and to one of the greatest Senators

ever to grace this body, TOM DASCHLE of South Dakota.

Unsurprisingly, I am sure I have known TOM longer than anyone here. I vividly remember his first campaign for Congress in 1978, the same year I ran for the South Dakota House of Representatives for the first time. We were two young candidates, almost the same age, recent graduates, the same year, of South Dakota colleges. While we were running for very different offices, I felt an immediate bond with him at that time.

TOM's first race for Congress was in many ways predictive of the career that would follow. He was then, and still is, the hardest working, most focused person I have ever met in any sphere of my life. That year he knocked on more than 40,000 doors, personally asking South Dakotans for their vote. I can tell you, knocking on 40,000 doors in the middle of a South Dakota winter is a real challenge.

TOM looked so young he was once mistaken as the paperboy at one of those doors—a woman asked how much money she owed him. I have a photo I cherish to this day of TOM and me together during that first campaign, both of us looking like we were 14 years old. It makes you wonder how anyone voted for either of us at that time.

I remember watching the election returns coming in for TOM's campaign that evening and it didn't look very good, frankly. In fact, when I went to bed that night I was almost certain he had lost. It was only when I woke up that I found TOM was only behind by 50 votes with a recount certain, and as it turned out, he was certified the winner officially by 14 votes out of 130,000 votes cast. Who would have dreamed that such a close victory in South Dakota would have been the beginning of such a distinguished career?

In the intervening years, I watched with admiration while TOM's career advanced in the House of Representatives. He was a natural leader, and I do not believe that many who knew him were surprised, in 1986, when he decided to run for the Senate, taking on the same man who, 6 years previously, defeated Senator George McGovern, an institution in our State.

It was far from an easy race, but TOM prevailed in the end, and his leaving his House seat opened it for my election that year as well. It was the culmination of those two elections which led to an extremely close working relationship but also to a very close friendship.

I have spent the last 18 years working side by side with TOM DASCHLE. I cannot imagine a better partner with whom to work. He is, as I mentioned earlier, the hardest working person I have ever known. He is also the most patient person I have ever known, as well as unfailingly generous—qualities that served him very well as Senate Democratic leader, an extremely demanding job.

There have been fewer than 2,000 Senators who have served our Nation in