sufficient numbers of police for public security duties in Kosovo, with a significant disparity in the amount of support provided by different Alliance members. Indeed, the number of police deployed is roughly half of what was planned. As a result, KFOR soldiers, who are trained to fight wars, are working as policemen, a job for which they have not been trained and should not be asked to perform indefinitely.

I agree.

We must be mindful of the fact that the United Nations and other international organizations can only succeed if the nations comprising these organizations contribute the needed resources.

In Kosovo, the UN needs the money to do the job. Only a small portion of the money pledged at last November's donors conference for Kosovo's budget has actually been delivered. This is the money that pays the salaries for teachers, judges, and street sweepers—the people who make Kosovo work and whose loyalty the United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) needs if it is to succeed. The Europeans and others have to carry their weight and deliver on their commitments.

I am particularly concerned with the performance thus far of the European Union. The EU has taken on the primary responsibility for the reconstruction of Kosovo. This is a job to which the EU committed—in recognition of the fact that the United States bore the lion's share of the cost of the war. Unfortunately, it is not quite working out as planned.

Last fall, the EU committed almost $500 million for reconstruction. Recently, the European Parliament reduced that commitment to less than $200 million, questioning Kosovo's ''absorption capacity.'' It now appears that there is a serious chance that even this reduced EU commitment will not arrive in time to make a difference.

I would like to quote from the excellent statement made by the Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee, Senator LEVIN, during last week's Committee hearing with General Clark:

> It is vitally important for the international community and particularly the nations of Europe to provide the funding and the civilian police that are so necessary if these missions (in Bosnia and Kosovo) are to be successful . . . The European Union can talk about a goal of greater Euoprean military strength—a stronger European pillar within NATO. But the first test is whether it will meet the responsibilities they have already accepted of providing $36 million and civilian police for Kosovo. On my scorecard, they are flunking the test.

The distinguished Ranking Member and I agree.

And again, during last Tuesday's hearing, Senator LEVIN reiterated and strengthen his message from last week by saying, ''There is a requirement (in Kosovo) for 6,000 civilian police, but less than 2,000 have been provided. We have provided our share but others have failed, and that failure endangers our troops and the success of our mission. Civil implementation of the cease fire is in real jeopardy and will fail unless a sufficient number of international civil police are put on the ground promptly by the Europeans. The European Union can talk all it wants to about its plans to provide a militarily strong European pillar within NATO under the European Security and Defense Identity. But that is just rhetoric. The reality is their failure to meet their current commitments in Kosovo.''

Since NATO troops were first deployed to Bosnia in December of 1995, the United States has spent almost $10 billion dollars to support our military commitment of troops to that nation. We have spent an additional $5 billion in Kosovo for the air campaign and the deployment of U.S. KFOR troops. The annual price-tag for these military commitments is $1.5 billion for Bosnia and $2 billion projected for Kosovo. This is an obligation for the American taxpayer.

In addition to these significant sums of money, I am concerned about the safety and welfare of the men and women of our Armed Forces, and the Armed Forces of the other nations, who every day patrol the towns and villages of Bosnia and Kosovo, subjecting themselves to substantial personal risk while performing duties traditionally not performed by military personnel.

As I said earlier, our troops have performed their mission—they have created a safe and secure environment, as I previously indicated. But the UN and other elements of the international community have not filled in behind our troops to perform their mission. The results is that our troops are forced to fill the vacuum, preforming missions for which they were not trained—acting as mayors, policemen, arbiters of disputes, large and small. I was told of U.S. troops who were guarding two old Serb women who did not want to leave their home, which happened to be in an Albanian village. I saw three U.S. soldiers guarding a Serb church in an Albanian section of Kosovo. We must ask ourselves, are these jobs our troops should be performing today, tomorrow or for an indefinite period, as is now projected? These are commendable, humanitarian objectives which should be assumed by entities other than the Armed Forces.

In Kosovo—as is the case in Bosnia—there is a level of hatred—personal, ethnic and religious—that is simply beyond our comprehension. When I was in Kosovo in January, I was told that most of the violence in Kosovo is now Albanian on Albanian violence. I find this troubling. The United States and our NATO allies went into this region for the purpose of stopping and reversing the ethnic cleansing of Albanians by Serbs. But what has been a consequence of our involvement? While hundreds of thousands of Albanians have returned to their homes, tens of thousands of Serbs have been driven from Kosovo—the result of attacks by returning Albanians. Now that the Serb population of Kosovo—such as it is—has been isolated in small pockets of the province, we are seeing growing violence by Albanians against fellow Albanians, simply for their past or present association with Serbs. In the town of Vitina, I was shown a store, owned by an Albanian, which had been bombed 2 days before our arrival. Why? The Albanian shopkeeper had purchased property from a Serb—he was a ''collaborator'' in the minds of hardline Albanians.

Is it realistic for us to think that these people can ever live together peacefully? Or are we wasting our time and money—and needlessly risking the lives of our people—trying to achieve the goal of a multiethnic society for Bosnia and Kosovo?

I believe that we have reached that point in time when it is the responsibility of the Congress to take action—to reexamine the goals, their achievability, and what appears to be our open-ended involvement in Bosnia and Kosovo for an undetermined period of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER: The Senator from Delaware.

(The remarks of Mr. ROTH pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 81 are located in today's RECORD under ''Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

BLOCK GRANTS IN EDUCATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong opposition to the use of block grants in education spending.

First, education is clearly the No. 1 issue this body, our Government, and our country will face in the next decade. We have huge educational problems. We are now an ideas economy. Alan Greenspan put it best. He said: High value is no longer added by moving things but by thinking things, that it is an idea that produces value.

In that kind of time and place, what could be more important than education? In an ideas economy, for America to have a mediocre educational system, which is what we have now, is a very real crisis. If we continue to be rated 15th, 16th, 17th among the educational systems of the OECD Western countries, the 22 countries in North America, Asia, and Europe, we are not going to stay the greatest country in the world by the time 2025 or 2050 rolls around. Fortunately, because of our democratic system and our free enterprise system, because of the great entrepreneurial nature of America, because we accept ambitious and intelligent people from all over the world to come here and grow and prosper, we have a little lead time but not much.

Our educational system is at a critical point. Over the next decade, for instance, high school enrollment will increase by 11 percent. Schools will need

to hire 2.2 million public schoolteachers. Over 50 percent of the teachers are over 50 years old. Every day more than 14 million children will attend schools in need of extensive repair and replacement, and 12 percent of all newly hired teachers who enter the workforce will enter without any training at all. That will be even higher in math and science, computer science, engineering, and languages, the kinds of things for which we need people.

So with the crisis upon us, all of a sudden we have a new proposal: a block grant. A block grant is exactly what we don't need to improve the educational system. A block grant is something that gives the school districts more money and doesn't direct them on how to spend it.

I find there is a contradiction among so many of my friends who are strong advocates of block grants. They say the educational system is poor. I agree in many instances. They say we spend too much money and waste too much money on education. Then they say: Give those same localities, without any direction, more money.

They can't have it both ways. Either the localities are doing a good job and need more money, which they are not professing because they really don't think they need more money, or the localities are doing a bad job and to give them more money makes very little sense at all.

The notion that we should take Federal dollars, which have been used to raise academic standards, reduce class size, recruit new teachers, hold schools accountable, and send them in an unmarked paper bag to the Governors breaks our commitment to help communities and parents across the country. Block grants are a blank check from the Federal Government. They fundamentally make no sense. They are bad government policy.

I am sure many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree with me that to separate the taxing authority and the spending authority makes no sense. The spending authority for that spending, if they don't have to raise the taxes, painful as that is, is not going to spend it as wisely as somebody who knows how important those dollars are.

Sometimes I think we would be a lot better off eliminating the block grant program and giving the money back to the taxpayers rather than the Federal Government taxing and then giving this blank check to the locality and letting them spend it.

A block grant is poor government policy to begin with because it separates the spending power from the taxing power. In education, it is even worse. We hear clamor in the land that the local school districts are not doing a good job. I have sympathy for those local school districts. First, they are so busy minute to minute and day to day trying to run a school system. They are up to their necks. Second, their only spending power is from the property tax—justifiably the most hated tax in America—so they can't raise new dollars.

I have sympathy for those local school districts, but we all agree they are not doing as good a job as they might. The irony is that my colleagues from the other side of the aisle would probably say it is not more money. It is wasted money. Yet here we are, giving them more money.

In today's global ideas-based economy, we cannot afford to have an atomized educational system. Instead, the trend must be for local, State, and Federal governments to work together with families and communities. What is very interesting about any public good is that there is no capitalism. Good ideas don't spread on their own. If someone invented a new heart valve in San Diego, it would spread to Boston in an hour. Why? Someone would sell it. That is what America is all about. But when a new educational innovation develops in one school district, it doesn't spread, frankly, because there is no capitalism.

The appropriate role of the Federal Government in education is to find what works and, on a matching grant basis, say to the locality, this is a program that works. We will pay half or three-quarters of the cost because we know you are strapped based on these high property taxes. You pay some and use it. We are not requiring you to use it. I don't like mandates. We are giving you the opportunity to use it because we have seen it works in some areas.

When I was working on the crime bill, this is what we did. We found there were, again, programs that worked.

Community policing: Wichita, KS, had developed community policing and done it well. But it hadn't spread to Topeka. So I put in a bill when I was chairman of the Crime Subcommittee in the other body and I said let's give the localities money to do community policing on a matching grant basis. The President came in, and in his usual intelligent and astute way on these matters, said let's call it ''100,000 cops on the beat.'' So we did and it has worked. It changed policing in America.

Without that program, we would not have had community policing. But the Federal Government played the appropriate role—finding a good idea, giving money as an incentive to help spread the idea—not 100 percent; that is a bad idea, not even 90 percent. Then it is like a block grant with no strings attached and money gets wasted. And then they let it happen. It is not bureaucracy that is the problem in Federal aid to education, as some who support the block grant would say. Only one-half of 1 percent of Federal aid to schools is spent on administration. The States use an additional 4 percent. All the rest, 95½ percent, goes to local school districts. It is not bureaucracy at all. In fact, the claims of those who spin stories of a grand Federal education bureaucracy ring hollow. In a letter written to the President by the House Committee on Education in the Workforce in 1997, the committee majority listed 760 so-called educational programs. They said we have too many. Combine them.

Look at the programs they call ''educational'' programs: Boating safety financial assistance, Air Force defense research sciences, biological response to environmental health hazards, financial assistance for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Those are not educational programs. In truth, the Federal Government provides, on average, only 7 percent of all K-through-12 educational funding. It is the State and local communities that should and do maintain control over educational priorities. But what Washington can do is help communities meet certain reform priorities when their budgets are stretched too thin. Again, if the system isn't working, why give more money with no strings attached to the very localities that we think can do better? Why not do it in a way that directs them? Sure, the local school board wants free money. Fine. Let them raise taxes and do it for themselves. Don't let us put more burden on the Federal taxpayers to do it.

Proponents of the block grants argue strenuously that control should be returned to the localities. But the irony here is the block grants would not return power to the communities; rather, it shifts control of the Federal funding away from parents and communities and gives it to politicians—Governors and the State legislature. This is the antithesis of local control.

What I would like to do before I conclude is look at a couple of examples of block grant proposals. The Straight A's Act gives the States and the Governors the authority to combine into a block grant Federal funds from 10 educational programs. More than 80 percent of all Federal support to elementary and secondary education will be included in the block grant. This sounds to me like LEA. I remember Law Enforcement Assistance—a block grant to law enforcement. That is the area in which I have the most expertise. Do you know what they did when no strings were attached? One police department bought a tank; another police department bought an airplane to take the police officers back and forth to Washington—I think it was a jet—all with block grant money. If we do this Straight A's Program, we will be back on the floor of the Senate a year or two later pointing out horror stories of how the taxpayers' money was wasted.

Under Straight A's, parents, teachers, principals, and school boards would no longer have a say in how the Federal dollars are spent. Schools would no longer be accountable for results and national priorities, such as funding for the neediest students and better teachers. New school buildings could be put aside for more salaries for administrators. If this program gets straight

A's, I would like to see what the curve is in that classroom.

The Senate Health Committee intends to mark up a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the next few weeks. I am concerned to learn that the bill currently includes a block grant for teacher quality and professional development, programs to reduce class size and Goals 2000. Yes, we need qualified teachers and smaller classes. They produce the best results for children. But with the committee bill, there is no guarantee that class size reduction or teacher development will be done well, or even done at all.

I ask my colleagues to look at the proposal that Senator KENNEDY is putting together. His leadership on this issue has been extraordinary. His proposal does not intend to dictate to localities what they must do or impose new mandates on localities. Rather, it says, here are our Federal priorities; do you want to be part of them? They include smaller class size and new school construction. Fine. You are going to match our dollars. If you don't want to be part of them, keep doing the same old thing, but not with Federal dollars, Federal taxpayer money, which gives you a free ride.

I hope my colleagues will look at Senator KENNEDY's proposal and will examine the folly of block grants. I look forward to the debate that may come on education in the near future.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes, and in the normal routine to return to Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska.

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

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, yesterday, I commented on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act amendments. I thought then, and I think today, there are a few remarks that I probably ought to make aside from complimenting the distinguished Senator for his untiring efforts to address nuclear waste in a logical and sensible way.

Mr. President, I rise to compliment Senator MURKOWSKI's leadership on the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act. I appreciate his efforts to enable progress on the nation's need for concrete action on spent nuclear fuel.

I find it amazing how fear of anything in this country with ''nuclear'' in its title, like ''nuclear waste'', seems to paralyze our ability to act decisively. Nuclear issues are immediately faced with immense political challenges.

There are many great examples of how nuclear technologies impact our daily lives. Yet few of our citizens know enough about the benefits we've gained from harnessing the nucleus to support actions focused on reducing the remaining risks.

Just one example that should be better understood and appreciated involves our nuclear navy. Their experience has important lessons for better understanding of these technologies.

The *Nautilus*, our first nuclear powered submarine, was launched in 1954. Since then, the Navy has launched over 200 nuclear powered ships, and about 85 are currently in operation. Recently, the Navy was operating slightly over 100 reactors, about the same number as those operating in civilian power stations across the country.

The Navy's safety record is exemplary. Our nuclear ships are welcomed into over 150 ports in over 50 countries. A 1999 review of their safety record was conducted by the General Accounting Office. That report stated: ''No significant accident—one resulting in fuel degradation—has ever occurred.'' For an Office like GAO, that identifies and publicizes problems with government programs, that's a pretty impressive statement.

Our nuclear powered ships have traveled over 117 million miles without serious incidents. Further, the Navy has commissioned 33 new reactors in the 1990s, that puts them ahead of civilian power by a score of 33 to zero. And Navy reactors have more than twice the operational hours of our civilian systems.

The nuclear navy story is a great American success story, one that is completely enabled by appropriate and careful use of nuclear power. It's contributed to the freedoms we so cherish.

Nuclear energy is another great American success story. It now supplies about 20 percent of our nation's electricity, it is not a supply that we can afford to lose. It's done it without release of greenhouse gases, with a superlative safety record over the last decade. The efficiency of nuclear plants has risen consistently and their operating costs are among the lowest of all energy sources.

I've repeatedly emphasized that the United States must maintain nuclear energy as a viable option for future energy requirements. And without some near-term waste solution, like interim storage or an early receipt facility, we are killing this option. We may be depriving future generations of a reliable power source that they may desperately need.

There is no excuse for the years that the issue of nuclear waste has been with us. Near-term credible solutions are not technically difficult. We absolutely must progress towards early receipt of spent fuel at a central location, at least faster than the 2010 estimates for opening Yucca Mountain that we now face or risk losing nuclear power in this country.

Senator MURKOWSKI's bill is a significant step toward breaking the deadlock which countries to threaten the future of nuclear energy in the U.S. I appreciate that he made some very tough decisions in crafting this bill that blends ideas from many sources to seek compromise in this difficult area.

One concession involves tying the issuance of a license for the ''early receipt facility'' to construction authorization for the permanent repository. I'd much prefer that we simply moved ahead with interim storage. An interim storage facility can proceed on its own merits, quite independent of decisions surrounding a permanent repository. Such an interim storage facility could be operational well before the ''early receipt facility'' authorized in this Act.

There are absolutely no technical issues associated with interim storage in dry casks, other countries certainly use it. Nevertheless, in the interests of seeking a compromise on this issue, I will support this Act's approach with the early receipt facility.

I appreciate that Senator MURKOWSKI has included Title III in the new bill with my proposal to create a new DOE Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. This new Office would organize a research program to explore new, improved national strategies for spent nuclear fuel.

Spent fuel has immense energy potential—that we are simply tossing away with our focus only on a permanent repository. We could be recycling that spent fuel back into civilian fuel and extracting additional energy. We could follow the examples of France, the U.K., and Japan in reprocessing the fuel to not only extract more energy, but also to reduce the volume and toxicity of the final waste forms.

Now, I'm well aware that reprocessing is not viewed as economically desirable now, because of today's very low uranium prices. Furthermore, it must only be done with careful attention to proliferation issues. But I submit that the U.S. should be prepared for a future evaluation that may determine that we are too hasty today to treat this spent fuel as waste, and that instead we should have been viewing it as an energy resource for future generations.

We do not have the knowledge today to make that decision. Title III establishes a research program to evaluate options to provide real data for such a future decision.

This research program would have other benefits. We may want to reduce the toxicity of materials in any repository to address public concerns. Or we may find we need another repository in the future, and want to incorporate advanced technologies into the final waste products at that time. We could, for example, decide that we want to maximize the storage potential of a future repository, and that would require some treatment of the spent fuel before final disposition.

Title III requires that a range of advanced approaches for spent fuel be studied with the new Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. As we do this,