

high-need schools in six districts. By the fifth year of the project, SC TIF has the potential to affect more than 60,000 children and 5,000 teachers and principals. These modifications include higher and varied teacher bonuses, the introduction of principal and assistant principal bonuses, more competitive Master and Mentor Teacher addendums, a new focus on marketing and recruiting, raising the value-added percentage in the performance pay from 50% to 60%, using MAP tests to give K-3 teachers an individual value-added score, and inclusion of related arts in the individual value-added gains calculations.

**DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (TEXAS)**

For the past decade, the Dallas ISD has provided incentives to teachers, principals, and other campus staff based on the value-added performance of their students under the Outstanding School Performance Award program. This project builds on this history and existing apparatus to identify and reward effective principals based on a combination of direct and value-added measures of student achievement and reward effective teachers based on value-added measures of their students' achievement. In addition, the project includes refinement of the Dallas database for tracking student-teacher assignments; incentives for principals and teachers to participate in substantive, high-standards professional development; incentives for highly effective teachers to move to and stay in high needs campuses; and procedures for insuring the integrity of test results.

**SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA  
(PENNSYLVANIA)**

The overall purpose of Philadelphia's initiative is to pilot a performance-based staff development and compensation system that provides teachers and principals with clear incentives that are directly tied to student achievement growth and classroom observations conducted according to an objective, standards-based rubric at multiple points during each school year. Twenty high-need urban elementary schools (grades 3-8) that have demonstrated high degrees of faculty buy-in will participate in the pilot. Leaders from the School District of Philadelphia's administration and from the two unions representing all Philadelphia teachers and principals have designed the pilot and will oversee its implementation.

**OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (OHIO)**

Key strategies of the Ohio Teacher Incentive Fund (OTIF) include implementing the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) in the Cincinnati and Columbus City Schools, expanding the Toledo Review and Alternative Compensation System (TRACS) in the Toledo City Schools, and developing and implementing the Cleveland Teacher Incentive System, a program modeled on TRACS, in the Cleveland City Schools. OTIF is a cooperative venture of the Ohio Department of Education; Columbus, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Toledo City Schools; and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching.

**EAGLE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT (COLORADO)**

In the past five years, Eagle County School District has invested over \$4.5 million (not including performance awards) to implement a performance-based compensation system for teachers and principals based on the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). This project is an expansion of the program and will utilize TIP grant funding to improve the quality of Master and Mentor teachers through increased salary augmentations and increased training. It will cover 13 high-need schools.

**WELD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT (COLORADO)**

This project will be implemented in the 4 high-need schools in the Weld County School

District. The district currently ranks last in teacher compensation compared to neighboring districts. The project objectives state that by year 2, a comprehensive principal and teacher differentiated compensation system based on student achievement gains and classroom evaluations will be fully operational. The Superintendent of Student Achievement of this district will manage the project.

**EXHIBIT 3**

**THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION,  
Washington, DC, February 8, 2007.**

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR ALEXANDER: Thank you for your efforts to amend the Joint Funding Resolution, H.R. 20, to provide level funding (\$99 million) for the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF).

As you may know, the lack of a fiscal year 2007 appropriation for TIF would have a significant impact on the program. The Department (ED) remains concerned that a lack of funding for TIF in fiscal year 2007 would jeopardize our ability to make timely continuation funding available for current grant recipients. While ED has reserved \$8.8 million from fiscal year 2006 funds to cover the increased costs proposed for the second year of operation for the 16 current TIF grantees, this amount will not cover all continuation costs for grantees.

A lack of fiscal year 2007 funding for TIF would also significantly limit our ability to support technical assistance to TIF grantees and ensure that information on teacher and principal compensation reform is available not only to TIF grantees, but also to the general public.

Finally, a lack of fiscal year 2007 funding would impact our ability to begin a national evaluation of the TIF program, which Congress called for when appropriating funds for this program. Our planned evaluation will be delayed until fiscal year 2008 unless funds are appropriated.

It should also be noted that a lack of funding in fiscal year 2007 may undermine the current TIF grant competition that is underway (with applications due on February 12, 2007). Potential grantees may be dissuaded from applying for TIF grants or spending time and resources developing high-quality applications if they believe the program's funding is in jeopardy.

Again, I thank you for your leadership on this important issue. Please do not hesitate to call if I can answer any additional questions.

Sincerely,

MARGARET SPELLINGS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business. The Senator from Illinois may speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Tennessee, whose interest in education is well recognized, I couldn't agree with him more. Not only is this program important, it is important to me. When the superintendent of the Chicago Public School System, Arnie Duncan, called me yesterday and said we need this money, I said to him: I know you do. It breaks my heart that we cannot give it to you at this moment.

I can go through the sordid history that brought us to this continuing resolution—our failure to pass the appropriations bills in the normal fashion last year, extending the Government on a piecemeal basis with a CR, as we call them, for a few months, and now facing the awesome task of funding the rest of the year with certainly limitations in funding that have caused a great deal of deprivation. This is a clear illustration and example of a program that is worth funding and that should be funded.

I say to my friend from Tennessee, if we cannot resolve it in this particular bill—and I doubt that we can because of the extraordinary circumstances—please let me join him and let's have others join in making sure this program is solid and funded for the next fiscal year. It is a good program, an excellent program. I want to see it move forward.

The quality of teachers may be the single greatest determinant in the success of education. I certainly want to join the Senator from Tennessee in making that happen.

**IRAQ**

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to move to another topic and say for anyone who has followed the debate this week on Iraq, it has been a frustration. We came to the Senate with the clear direction of the American people to change course in Iraq. Unfortunately, the minority—the Republican minority—decided it was more important to change the subject than to change course. So they defeated our efforts to bring this issue of our policy in Iraq to a debate on Monday.

In the Senate, it takes 60 votes to do anything that is important or controversial. And so we needed help from the Republican side of the aisle because we only have 51 when we are at full complement, and with Senator JOHNSON recuperating, we only had 50. We needed 10 of their stalwarts to join us, to move forward and say: Let's have this debate on Iraq.

I was hopeful we would have that many. At least seven or eight Republican Senators said they disapprove of President Bush's plan to escalate this war. I thought that was a good starting point, and maybe others will join in to make sure there is a real debate.

Come time for the vote on Monday, we fell short. The Democrats came and voted, with all but one exception, to move forward on the debate, but our Republican friends would not join us. So the debate on Iraq stopped in its tracks. Efforts were made over the next day or two, with no success whatever, to try to revive this debate on Iraq. Now we find ourselves in a position where we moved to the next stage.

That debate was about the Warner resolution, a Republican from Virginia, with bipartisan sponsorship that we agreed on the Democratic side would be the vote. I don't know how more accommodating the majority could be to

say to the minority, in this case the Republicans: We will let one of your own write the resolution that we will debate. That is what we said on the Warner resolution. We went further and said to the Republican minority: And then the countervailing resolution, the one in opposition to Warner, write that as well. And they did. That was the resolution of Senator JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona. So we had two competing Republican resolutions in a Senate with a Democratic majority.

To argue we are playing politics with this issue, I think, fails on its face. I don't know how we could be more accommodating, but obviously we didn't reach enough on the other side to get the debate started.

Interestingly enough, I happened to turn on the television last night in my office and here Senator JOHN WARNER came to the floor to try to explain what happened when seven or eight Republican Senators who said they opposed the President's plan, some who openly supported Senator WARNER's resolution and Senator WARNER himself, all voted not to debate his resolution. It is hard to explain to most people who try to follow the arcane procedures of the Senate.

Having said that, the debate is not over. The debate will continue, maybe not on the Senate floor for the next few days. But all across America, in grocery stores, in offices, in churches, all across America, people are talking about this war. When I am contacted by people back in my hometown of Springfield, IL, or Chicago, people are saying this has to change. I understand what they are thinking about in terms of their own children, in terms of the brave soldiers who are there, and in terms of the families who are waiting patiently for their loved ones to return.

We will return to this debate, but the next stage is not going to be a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. The next stage is going to be much more serious. As I said on the floor before, the Warner resolution was a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which is merely an expression of sentiment. Important as it is, it is still very thin soup compared to an actual amendment or bill which could make some change in the way we wage this war. That is the next stage. The House may take it up before us because we have to pass the spending bill, and then we are going to return to it.

Senator REID, our majority leader, has made it clear. The Republicans will not prevail when it comes to stopping this debate on Iraq. We believe the last election was very clear. The American people want us to change the policy in Iraq. We change it by deliberating and debating and reaching the best consensus we can, and that is what we will try to do.

I hope enough Republicans will join us in this debate. This is critically important. If they are loyal to the President and loyal to his policies, then so be it; stand on the floor and defend

them. If they agree with us that there has to be a change, that this escalation of the war moves us in the wrong direction, they will also have a chance to have their voice on the floor. But to try to shut down the debate time and again will not ultimately work. The American people want us to face this issue and face the reality of this war and what it means to us.

The National Intelligence Estimate, just recently released, paints a very bleak picture in Iraq about a civil war that is complicated by an insurgency that is being fought by both Iraqis and foreign al-Qaida fighters, along with widespread violent crime. There have been 2 million refugees in Iraq so far, by the estimate of major international agencies. Some 34,000 Iraqi civilians were killed last year. Another 1,000 died last week alone—Iraqi civilians. These are not the insurgents and terrorists. Many of these are innocent people—men, women, and children—who happened to go to the market or school on the day a bomb was detonated.

We have lost more than 3,100 soldiers as of today. In this month of February, 8 days into this month, we have lost 26 American soldiers, more than 3 a day. As we postpone this debate for days and weeks, American soldiers continue to die and continue to be injured. That is the reality. We have to understand the urgency of this debate and the urgency to get it right.

The President says he needs 21,500 troops more in Baghdad and Iraq. Certainly now the CBO tells us the real number could be 35,000 or 48,000 because those 21,500 are ground troops, combat troops. They need support troops as well, and many of them will be in harm's way.

When asked how much this new escalation of the war will cost, the President estimates \$5.6 billion over 8 months. The Congressional Budget Office takes a look and says: No, you are wrong; \$27 billion over 12 months.

Some of us remember a man named Lawrence Lindsey, head of the White House's National Economic Council, who made the fatal political error in 2002 of saying that he thought the war in Iraq could cost us between \$100 billion and \$200 billion. For his estimate, for his candor, Mr. Lindsey was canned. He was fired. Secretary Rumsfeld got on television and said: I think the war might cost us \$50 billion. That is on the record. The record shows us he was wrong.

To date, the American taxpayers have paid over \$350 billion for this war. With the new request, it will go to over \$500 billion.

Imagine the debate we just had between Senator ALEXANDER and myself about \$200 million to improve teachers and schools across America that we cannot afford because we are spending \$2.5 billion a week on this war in Iraq. We cannot afford to improve the quality of our teachers in America's schools because of the money we have

committed to a war in Iraq, a war which, sadly, has no end in sight and a war which is being escalated by this President.

Some argue—I heard it on the floor repeatedly—that any debate about the President's policy is going to hurt the morale of the troops.

This is a copy of The Washington Times, a newspaper which I don't frequently read, but this morning's newspaper says: "War foes will not hurt morale," contradicting the statement made by some that if we express opposition to the President's war policy, we are going to hurt morale. Who was it who said that war foes—those who question the President's policy—will not hurt morale? It turns out to be none other than GEN Peter Pace of the U.S. Marine Corps, who is, of course, Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff. He said it. I want to quote it. I thought this was excellent:

From the standpoint of the troops, I believe that they understand how our legislature works and that they understand that there's going to be this kind of debate. They understand democracy. They understand you can disagree with the President without being disloyal to the men and women in uniform. They understand you can question whether we have enough troops, whether they are adequately armored, whether they are adequately trained, and question those policies of the President without in any way reflecting on our admiration for the troops and their service to our country.

We are fighting for a democracy in Iraq. That is what we say. A democracy has open debate and disagreement with leadership. If we can't have the same open debate and disagreement with the leadership in America, then we are not exercising the powers of our own democracy.

Finally, I would say, Mr. President, that a friend of mine and colleague in the Senate, Senator ENSIGN of Nevada, came to the floor yesterday and quoted me. Unfortunately, Senator ENSIGN's statement was not accurate. He quoted me as saying recently that:

If we need initially some troops in Baghdad, for example, to quiet the situation, make it more peaceful so that our soldiers start coming home, then I—myself—would accept it.

Well, he used this as evidence that many Democrats, including myself, had said, well, they are for increasing the number of troops. Here is what I was saying. If we need some additional troops to quiet the situation in Baghdad, then I would be open to it. If there was truly a plan to exit this untenable situation, where a short-term shift in troops to Baghdad could make a difference, I would happily entertain it.

But the fact is that this is not a short-term proposal, it is not part of a plan that clearly brings our troops home, and putting more troops in the heart of a civil war does not quiet the situation. Our troops have achieved what is achievable in Iraq. As the new

NIE states, Iraq is now in a civil war and worse. That is not a battle that U.S. troops can win. Only the Iraqis can. The President's plan clearly is not designed to bring our troops home. Nor is he being honest about its costs or the numbers of men and women who will be sent to Iraq in this escalation.

My respect for Senator ENSIGN is not diminished by this misunderstanding.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I am very concerned that the continuing resolution does not adequately support our Armed Forces at this critical time. Our military commanders tell me that the resolution passed by the House of Representatives could deprive our bases of \$3.1 billion of crucial Federal funding. I am particularly concerned about the nearly \$375 million of BRAC funding that is supposed to go to Fort Leavenworth and Fort Riley. As a member of the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee, I support the Hutchinson-Inhofe amendment to reinstate the \$3.1 billion for BRAC that will be lost in the current version of the continuing resolution.

Several of Fort Riley and Fort Leavenworth's projects are in jeopardy unless full funding is restored, including: the Regional Correctional Facility at Fort Leavenworth, the Battle Command Training Center at Fort Riley, the Child Development Center at Fort Riley, Fort Riley's Consolidated Soldier and Family Medical Clinic, Fort Riley runway improvements, phase I of the Combat Aviation Brigade complex, and the increment 2 of the First Division headquarters construction.

Unless we correct this problem in the continuing resolution, it will have a domino effect on future BRAC funding, which will be detrimental to our operations around the world. Fort Riley is a good example. First Division soldiers from Fort Riley continue to deploy in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Fort Riley trains the soldiers who will embed with both Afghan and Iraqi forces. Right now, Fort Riley has enough soldiers deployed overseas that it can manage base operations. But as one Fort Riley official put it a few weeks ago, world peace is Fort Riley's worst nightmare: if all the soldiers come home, there is no place to house them all. We need to fund BRAC priorities to stay on schedule and make sure the appropriations process in the Senate does not adversely affect the ability of our Armed Forces to execute their missions.

We cannot afford to play games with military construction funds. We worked hard last year to write good legislation that funded key priorities. That funding should be restored. All of us come to the floor pledging to support the men and women of our Armed Forces. Our promises of support will ring hollow if we fail to turn our words into action. We need to restore full funding to military construction in this continuing resolution.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. We are still in morning business, I believe.

#### CLARIFYING A STATEMENT ON IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I earlier came to the floor and spoke of a statement made on the Senate floor by Senator ENSIGN. I misread my notes for that statement. I want to clarify that Senator ENSIGN did, in fact, quote me accurately when he said that I had made a statement:

If we need initially some troops in Baghdad, for example, to quiet the situation, make it more peaceful so that our soldiers start coming home, then I would accept it.

That, in fact, was a statement that I had made. The point I would like to make at this moment is, that was part of a longer interview. In the longer interview I raised questions about whether this would be part of a strategy to bring our troops home. That has been my position consistently.

My feeling was, if, as we move troops—into Baghdad to protect that city, trying to bring peace to it so our troops could come home, I could understand that. But I believe today, as I believed when I made that statement, that whatever movement of troops we would make would have to be with the clear understanding that our troops were coming home.

I apologize if my earlier statement suggested that Senator ENSIGN had said something different. He did accurately quote me, but the quote that he used did not accurately reflect my feeling on the entire situation.

I want to make that clear to Senator ENSIGN. As I said when I finished my remarks, my feelings for him are not diminished and my feelings that this war should end and our troops should come home soon are not diminished either.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT RANDY MATHENY

Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, I rise to express my sympathy over the loss of

United States Army National Guard SGT Randy Matheny of Nebraska. Sergeant Matheny was killed in Baghdad when an improvised explosive device detonated next to the vehicle he was in. He was 20 years old.

Sergeant Matheny was part of a close-knit family in McCook, NE. A 2004 graduate of McCook High School, Sergeant Matheny is remembered as a quiet but likable young man who enjoyed learning about auto technology and computers.

Following in the footsteps of two older siblings, he joined the Army in March, 2005 as a heavy-vehicle driver. His sister, Karen, is currently serving her second tour with the Army National Guard in Iraq. His brother, Paul, is a private first class in the regular Army. Sergeant Matheny had been serving in Iraq with the 1074th Transportation Company since early fall. We're proud of Sergeant Matheny's service to our country as well as the service of thousands of brave Americans who are currently serving in Iraq.

In addition to his brother and sister, Sergeant Matheny is survived by his father Gary Matheny; his mother Jan Collins, and her husband Duane Collins; and stepsisters Kori Collins and Laci Ingels.

I ask my colleagues to join me and all Americans in honoring Sergeant Randy Matheny.

#### MAYORS UNITE TO FIGHT GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on January 23, over 50 members of Mayors Against Illegal Guns met in Washington, DC, for the coalition's 2007 National Summit. Mayors from 27 States and the District of Columbia shared practices and strategies, discussed the importance of forging alliances with gun owners, and united in opposition to laws that restrict cities' access to, and use of, gun trace data. They also heard the results of a bipartisan national poll which shows strong support for tougher enforcement of existing gun laws and common sense provisions to prevent and solve crimes.

The original group of 15 mayors first met in April 2006 in New York City, where they pledged to seek the involvement of up to 50 mayors from around the country. By early June 2006, 52 mayors had joined the coalition. Within a few days following the conclusion of the 2007 summit, 31 additional mayors from across the Nation joined the coalition. The coalition currently includes 154 mayors from 44 States and the District of Columbia.

As cochair of the coalition, New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg described this growth by saying:

Our coalition is growing because—as the national summit showed—mayors of both parties are committed to doing more to keep illegal guns off the street, which threaten the safety of our citizens, especially our police officers. The 31 new mayors joining the ranks of our coalition demonstrate that momentum is building for our effort to crack