

be able to claim that is acting responsibly on behalf of American citizens.

In closing Mr. President, I would like to urge my colleagues to support the Federal Research Investment Act. I further challenge each of you to reach out to your own universities and engage them in this critical dialogue as to the future of science and technology funding. This federal funding, after all, is a public investment in America's future.●

#### TRADE SANCTIONS COMPENSATION

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill to compensate farmers if we choose to continue using food as a weapon. I do not support the use of food in this way, but if this country chooses to use food as a weapon, then the producers of that weapon deserve to be compensated, just as all other weapons manufacturers are compensated.

Today, ten percent of the world's wheat markets are off limits to American farmers because of sanctions. If we include the recent loss of the markets in Pakistan and India, sixteen percent of the world's markets are not available. Farmers in my state, and farmers across this nation, cannot afford to pay for this foreign policy option out of their own pockets.

This bill amends an existing statute which is so narrowly drawn that, despite ongoing sanctions, the statute has not required any compensation to farmers. The existing statute requires that the sanction be imposed by the executive branch of government, be unilateral, and not be joined by any other nation. It also limits compensation to three years and allows the Secretary of Agriculture to choose between direct compensation and export assistance programs.

This bill eliminates all of the restrictions in the existing statute which preclude it from being of any assistance to farmers hit by declining prices caused by lost export markets. The new statute will make it clear that, if our government chooses to use food as a weapon, then those who produce that food will not alone bear the financial burden. I ask that my colleagues join me in passage of this bill to ensure fairness in our foreign trade policy.●

#### THE PROGRAM FOR INVESTMENT IN MICRO-ENTREPRENEURS OF 1998

● Mr. KERRY. Last week I joined Senators KENNEDY, DOMENICI and BINGAMAN in introducing a bill to establish the PRIME program for investment in microenterprise. I applaud Senators KENNEDY and DOMENICI for their work in developing this legislation and welcome their efforts in supporting the development of business skills for micro-entrepreneurs. Access to education and training is critical for the development of small businesses in the United States.

Developing microenterprise is crucial to the financial health of our nation. Small businesses have been the engine of growth in our economy and have provided virtually all of our country's net new jobs. Very small businesses, those with four or fewer employees, created more jobs from 1992 through 1996 than large businesses employing more than 500 workers. However, many of those who yearn to turn an innovative idea into a marketable product need assistance in developing the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in today's competitive marketplace. That is why, as Ranking Democratic Member of the Senate Small Business Committee, I have been such a strong supporter of programs to assist microenterprise development, especially through the microloan program within the Small Business Administration. This program has provided \$67 million in microloans to very small businesses in every state. A great percentage of microloans have gone to traditionally underserved groups, including 43 percent to women-owned businesses, 39 percent to minority-owned businesses and 11 percent to veteran-owned businesses. I am committed to seeing this and other programs that assist microenterprise grow and thrive.

The Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) fund represents another type of community investment initiative. It uses limited federal resources to invest in and build the capacity of private, for profit and nonprofit financial institutions, leveraging private capital and private-sector talent and creativity. The fund's main program allows local CDFIs to apply for financial and technical assistance. This funding can be used to support basic financial services, housing for low-income people, businesses that provide jobs for low-income people and technical assistance for capacity-building, training, and development of programs, investments or loans. The CDFI fund offers a combination of increased access to capital and institutional capacity building that is vital to low-income communities, and fill a need that the marketplace is not meeting.

We have all heard a lot about the need for individual responsibility, family responsibility, and community responsibility. The microenterprise program within CDFI give us an opportunity to lend a helping hand to those in need of financial aid and technical assistance so they can fulfill their personal, family, and community responsibilities. It has given many a chance to break the cycle of poverty and welfare and move toward individual responsibility and financial independence.

The PRIME bill introduced last week seeks to increase CDFI's funding for technical assistance to give micro-entrepreneurs access to information on developing a business plan, record-keeping, planning, financing and marketing that are crucial in the develop-

ment of a small business. Furthermore, this legislation will sponsor research on the most innovative and successful ways of encouraging these new businesses and enabling them to succeed.

This legislation will allow organizations which assist microenterprises to develop new products and services for their customers and expand on existing services. In Massachusetts, Working Capital, a recipient of a Presidential Award for Excellence in Microenterprise Development in 1997, currently offers three complementary programs to its microenterprise customers which could be eligible for additional funding under the PRIME legislation. First, Working Capital provides business credit to micro-entrepreneurs. Second, they provide business education and training on how to draw up business plans and prepare financial projections, and how to use these tools in managing their businesses. Third, they offer networking opportunities to connect micro-entrepreneurs to each other and give them a sense of belonging within a community which faces the same challenges.

The PRIME legislation will assist in the development of programs such as those offered by Working Capital in Massachusetts and similar organizations across the country and will assist more Americans in taking a chance on the American dream of owning their own small business. I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact this important legislation.●

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 2614

Mr. LOTT. I now ask unanimous consent the Senate turn to Calendar No. 404, H.R. 2614, the Reading Excellence Act, and immediately following the reporting by the clerk, the chairman be recognized to withdraw the committee amendment and there be 30 minutes for debate to be equally divided in the usual form with no amendments or motions in order.

I further ask that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of H.R. 2614, all without any intervening action or debate.

I would like to note that I have discussed this with White House officials, and they have urged that we try to find a way to get this legislation up. Actually, this was a week or two ago, so we have been trying to get something worked out. I would like very much for us to be able to do that.

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, and I do not have any caveat to the unanimous-consent agreement, but would the majority leader modify his request to include an amendment from the Democratic side which would be the only amendment in order, and that it be the text of the committee-reported substitute amendment as modified; that there would be 1 hour for debate on the amendment equally divided, and that upon the use

or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the committee-reported amendment?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would have to object to that at this time because if we add any amendments to this bill in its present form, then it would require further House action. And, of course, the House has already adjourned for the July 4 recess until July 14.

I note also, if we do not do this bill now in the form that it was called up, the money that would have been used for this Reading Excellence Program, some \$206 million, I believe it was—something of that nature—would then go over to the IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act, so that money would be gone. So we really are in a box here.

I think everybody would like to do the Reading Excellence Act. But if we don't do it in the form that I have called it up, it would have to go back to the House. Basically, then, we wouldn't get anything done. We need to send it directly to the President.

So that is why I would be constrained to object to that modification.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, it is hard for me to understand, when this was a House bill and it came over and the Senate committee studied it and sent it to the Senate floor with a substitute amendment, and then we don't want to take the committee substitute amendment.

"There is something about that," as we would say down in West Kentucky, "that ain't right." So we are again telling the committee you can go through all of your work, you can do your hearings, you can do your markup, but you did the wrong thing.

So I think the amendment that we offered, which was a committee amendment as modified, was appropriate. If the majority leader wishes to object to that, why, that is the way it has to be.

Mr. LOTT. I believe, Mr. President, then, the Senator objects to the original request?

Mr. FORD. You objected to mine, so that ended it right there.

Mr. LOTT. You never said you object to it, then, as proposed. So you object to it as proposed?

Mr. FORD. Sure, and you object to mine as proposed by the committee.

Mr. LOTT. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I oppose the House version of the Reading Excellence Act, and I also oppose the process by which it is being brought to the Senate at the last minute in an effort to pass this bad bill under the pressure of the July 1 funding deadline.

On May 13th, six weeks ago, the Labor and Human Resources Committee approved an alternative bill on this issue, with unanimous bipartisan support, and with the strong backing of educators, reading specialists, and community organizations across the country. Despite this overwhelming

support for the Senate committee bill, the Republican leadership refused to allow the full Senate to act on it. Instead, they did nothing for six weeks. Now, as the July 1 deadline is upon us, they insist that we swallow the deeply flawed House bill.

What is at stake here is nothing less than the way teachers and schools across the country will be allowed to help children learn to read.

Organizations throughout the nation who know this well are adamantly opposed to the House bill. These groups include the American Association of School Administrators—the International Reading Association—the Council of Chief State School Officers—the National School Boards Association—the National Parent Teacher Association—the National Council of Teachers of English—the American Federation of Teachers—the National Education Association—the National Association of Elementary School Principals—the National Conference on Language and Literacy—the Conference on College Composition and Communications—the National Association of State Boards of Education—Reach Out and Read.

All of these groups are doing the hard day-to-day work, helping children learn to read. They say that no bill would be better than the House bill, because the House bill will not help them do the work they need to do.

In last year's appropriations legislation, Congress reserved \$210 million for a child literacy program if enacted by July 1. By missing the July 1 deadline, we miss an initial opportunity. But we will have many other opportunities this session to pass a bill we can all support—and fund it accordingly.

Many successful models to help children learn to read well now exist, but they are not yet available to all children. As a result, far too many children in communities across the country are denied the opportunity to learn to read well. The statistics are appalling. Forty percent of 4th grade students do not achieve the basic level in reading, and 70 percent of 4th graders do not achieve the proficient level.

We must do more—much more—to help all children learn to read well. Many of the reading difficulties experienced by teenagers and adults today could have been prevented by adequate intervention in early childhood. By working to ensure that all children learn to read well in the early grades, we can also reduce the need for costly special education instruction in later grades.

The time has come to pass a bill that will help all children learn to read well. Child literacy is an important goal, and if we are to reach this goal, we need well-educated, well-trained teachers prepared to give children the special assistance they deserve. We need dedicated and trained volunteer tutors. We need support for successful community programs to improve family literacy and teach parents how to

read more effectively with their children at home. We need support for innovative community efforts to help children learn to read before they enter school.

This House-passed bill is not an adequate response to these problems. This bill undermines state and local responsibility for public education. My Republican colleagues want to create a new state bureaucracy and new federal control over public education. These are the same Republicans who say they want school vouchers and block grants, in order to give parents and communities more choice and more control over their children's education.

State and local education agencies and school administrators are doing well in creating, implementing, and coordinating innovative efforts to help children learn. We should do more to support these efforts. We should provide community organizations with the resources they need to bring successful programs to more people. Instead, my colleagues want to bypass state leadership, undermine local control, and create a new state bureaucracy, when states and communities are already prepared to implement new literacy programs and oversee the use of new Federal funding.

State Departments of Education and local education agencies are already working successfully to coordinate local, State, and Federal resources to improve education and provide higher quality education to children. It makes no sense to bypass the current State leadership and require states to create a new State bureaucracy.

Another serious problem with this bill is that it brings Federal control into the classroom and dictates how teachers teach reading. This bill specifies only one way to teach reading skills. It ignores the research and recommendations of the leading educators. During the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee hearing on child literacy, we heard from two of the most distinguished researchers—Doctor Catherine Snow of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, who chairs the Committee on the Prevention of Reading Difficulties at the National Academy of Sciences, and Doctor Reid Lyon of the National Institutes of Health. They emphasized that the best way to help all children learn to read is to promote a variety of the best practices and give local educators the freedom to tailor programs to meet local needs.

Doctor Snow testified that a solution to reading problems has not been achieved because of an:

Unrealistic desire for a simpler answer. Reading is a complex and multifaceted outcome, determined by many factors. Ensuring adequate reading progress for every child . . . requires providing all of the many, varied experiences that will benefit their reading.

Doctor Lyon testified that:

Learning to read requires different skills at different levels of development. . . . It does

not have anything to do with philosophy, and it does not have anything to do with politics. It has to do with making sure the kids get the ideas. That is it. . . . To be able to read our language, you have to know the sounds. You have got to know how to map it onto the letters . . . you have got to do it quickly, and you have got to know why you are reading and have good vocabulary and the things that Dr. Snow spoke about. It is never an either/or.

This bill will prevent teachers from following that sound advice. Instead, teachers will be forced to follow a mandate from Washington requiring all teachers across the country to follow one formula to teach reading—regardless of local needs. Is this what the Republicans mean when they ask for more local control of education? Schools and communities already have control over education. The Federal Government shouldn't start micro-managing their reading programs.

We should be doing more, not less, to ensure that teachers and school districts are free to design programs to meet the unique local needs of the children. The Reading Excellence Act approved by the Senate Committee by a unanimous, bi-partisan vote would give local educators the flexibility and training the experts say they need.

This bill doesn't just take control away from public schools. It also takes money away from public schools. We all recognize that recruiting and training more tutors is an important goal. President Clinton began his effort two years ago, with his "America Reads Challenge." The Senate Committee bill would build on the success of that program, so that local schools will benefit from available community resources.

The House bill is a detour away from these worthy goals. Instead of helping schools capitalize on volunteer tutors and community resources, it wastes funds on private tutoring programs. It denies support for successful school-based programs in which tutoring assistance is closely linked to a child's classroom instruction.

The bill also requires local schools to spend time, money, and other scarce resources overseeing private tutoring programs. Funneling scarce public dollars into these private programs will undermine accountability for academic results and expenditure of federal dollars.

This bill has major flaws. It does little or nothing to help public school children learn to read or improve their chance of receiving a good education. Other provisions in the bill are worthwhile, because they encourage better teaching, more trained volunteer tutors, and more support for community-based family literacy programs. These initiatives will ensure that many children get the extra assistance they need to learn to read well and early.

These issues are too important for us to leave this House bill as the final word. I will do all I can to pass a strong bipartisan bill in the Senate in the coming months—the nation's children deserve no less.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—  
H.R. 3717

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now turn to Calendar No. 361, H.R. 3717, prohibiting Federal funds for the distribution of needles; that there be 30 minutes for debate to be equally divided with no amendments or motions in order. I further ask that following the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to third reading and final passage, all without intervening action or debate, and finally I ask unanimous consent it be in order for me to ask for the yeas and nays on passage at this time.

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I do object on behalf of this side.

Mr. LOTT. I now ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FORD. I object.

Mr. LOTT. Again, Mr. President, I should note that if we could have gotten that agreement, since it has already passed the House, this bill would have gone directly to the President for his signature. It passed the House April 29th by a vote of 287 to 140. I would think that this is something we would want to do. I think for the Federal Government to be distributing needles encourages people to use needles for drug abuse, and I had hoped we could get it cleared. We had worked earlier to try to get some sort of agreement on how we could clear it, with maybe even some amendments being ordered. We could not do it.

Also, in order to get the President's signature, we would have to do it in this way.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—  
H.R. 2610

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we turn to Calendar No. 273, H.R. 2610, the reauthorization of the drug czar office, and immediately following the reporting by the clerk, the chairman be recognized to modify the amendment, the committee substitute; that there be 30 minutes for debate to be equally divided with no amendments or motions in order. I further ask that following the conclusion or yielding back of this time, the Senate proceed to immediate adoption of the committee substitute to be followed immediately by third reading and final passage, all without intervening action or debate. And, finally, I ask unanimous consent it be in order for me to ask for the yeas and nays on passage at this time.

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, there are some who had hoped to offer some amendments. They were in the process of trying to work these amendments out where they would be agreeable. That has not transpired yet. So, then, on behalf of this side, I object.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I must object. I object because what the major-

ity leader proposes is to add a very significant piece of substantive drug legislation relating to the crack-powder cocaine sentencing issues.

I note that the Judiciary Committee has not reported this legislation. This legislation is subject to significant debate. For example, the costs of the most recent proposal offered by Senators ABRAHAM and ALLARD are very significant.

According to the Justice Department—the 5-year cost estimate to our federal prison budget is more than \$790 million. The 10-year estimate—more than \$1.9 billion.

This is just one example of the significant policy implications of this proposal. Frankly, the Judiciary Committee must be given the opportunity to report this legislation before we debate this on the floor.

In contrast, we have fully debated the drug director legislation introduced last summer. The Judiciary Committee has debated it, the committee held hearings, the committee developed a bipartisan re-authorization bill, the committee reported the bill last November, since then we have worked with Senator MCCAIN and the Armed Services Committee to work out their issues with this bill.

The bottom lines—we have a bipartisan, fully debated, bill; and we need to get the drug director's office re-authorized.

There are many particular, specific drug policy issues to debate. Crack-cocaine is just one of them. Youth drug abuse, youth violence, drug interdiction, and many more all need to be debated.

But, let's keep our eye on the ball, and let's re-authorize General McCaffrey's office. The General needs our support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I should note we had at least one very important amendment that a Senator wanted to offer on this side of the aisle to this bill, too, dealing with the penalties for the use of powder cocaine. Certainly, it is a very important issue, and I would like it to be considered, but I called upon that Senator—actually it was two Senators—and said you will have a chance to offer that on other legislation including State, Justice, Commerce. He was willing, then, to agree to put it aside.

I really think we need to reauthorize the drug czar office. I am hoping this is not the final word on this. Maybe we can work out something in July to consider it. But our problem is, we are really running out of time. I think it is going to be unconscionable if we can't find some way to quickly reauthorize the drug czar's office. We will have to do it without it taking up more than just a couple or 3 hours, because we just don't have the time, when you look at the appropriations bills and everything else we are going to need to do.