

U.S.C. 2463(c)(2)(D)) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRY; ILO ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARY COUNTRY.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any least-developed beneficiary developing country or any beneficiary developing country that is an ILO eligible beneficiary country.”

(C) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF ADDITIONAL BENEFITS.—Section 503 of such Act (19 U.S.C. 2463) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF ADDITIONAL BENEFITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the designation of any country as an ILO eligible beneficiary country for purposes of the benefits described in subsection (a)(1)(D) if the President determines that—

“(A) the country no longer meets the criteria set forth in section 507(6); or

“(B) imports of the article to which such additional benefits have been granted have increased in such amounts as to cause, or threaten to cause, injury to a domestic industry producing an article like or directly competitive with the article.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE OF WITHDRAWAL, ETC.; ADVICE TO CONGRESS.—

“(A) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A country shall cease to be an ILO eligible beneficiary country on the day on which the President issues an Executive order or Presidential proclamation revoking the designation of such country under this title.

“(B) ADVICE TO CONGRESS.—The President shall, as necessary, advise Congress on the application of subsection (a)(1)(D) and the actions the President has taken to withdraw, to suspend, or to limit the application of preferential treatment with respect to any country which has failed to adequately meet the criteria described in section 507(6).”

(d) DEFINITIONS.—Section 507 of such Act (19 U.S.C. 2467) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) ILO ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARY COUNTRY.—The term ‘ILO eligible beneficiary country’ means a least-developed beneficiary developing country or a beneficiary developing country that—

“(A) the President determines, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, is implementing and enforcing the provisions of Convention No. 138 of the General Conference of the International Labor Organization; and

“(B) has requested the additional benefits described in section 503(a)(1)(D).

“(7) ARTICLE ORIGINATING IN AN ILO ELIGIBLE BENEFICIARY COUNTRY.—An article is an article originating in an ILO eligible beneficiary country if the article meets the rules of origin for an article set forth in section 503(a)(2), except that in applying section 503(a)(2), any reference to a beneficiary developing country shall be deemed to refer to an ILO eligible beneficiary country.”

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, in a short while we will begin the debate again on the Ed-Flex bill that has been on the floor for the last several weeks. It is a bipartisan bill. Democrats and Republicans alike are supporting this bill. It is a simple bill, essentially, that will allow some of our school districts to be more flexible with their education dollars; for the liability for some of the waivers to be transferred from the Department of Education directly to the Governors, so the Governors in our States can provide some of the waivers based on some specific clauses that are in the bill. Essentially, it is a matter of paperwork being moved from the Nation’s Capital to the Governors’ desks. It is a bill, again, that is supported broadly.

I have come to the floor numerous times over the last week to talk about an amendment which I hope to offer today regarding class size reduction. A year ago, the President talked about the most important goal in education, one of the most important goals we have—that of reducing class size in grades 1 through 3. Studies have shown us consistently that reducing class size in those grades makes a tremendous difference in the learning of young children—in their math, reading, language scores, and in their ability to go on to college. It improves discipline problems, as shown by numerous studies that I, again, hope to be able to talk about once my amendment comes to the floor.

We talked about this amendment all last year during the session. Then, in a bipartisan bill last October, in the budget process we passed the beginning phase of reducing class size and began a commitment to this country that we would help our schools across this country begin to reduce class sizes in grades 1 through 3, where it makes a difference. It was a bipartisan effort last year. It should be a bipartisan effort this year.

This is a critical issue right now in this country, today, where school boards across our country are looking for whether or not we just made some kind of political offering last October, right before the elections, or whether we really meant it when we said we were going to join with our schools across this country in this commitment to reduce class size.

It is extremely timely that this Senate go on record right now with a commitment to our school districts, to let them know that we are there for them, that this wasn’t just a fly-by-night political operation in October, it was a commitment from us at the Federal level to work hand in hand with schools across this country to begin to reduce class size. My amendment will authorize this program for the next 6 years. It is extremely important, be-

cause our school boards right now are putting their budgets together. They are determining what kind of money they will have.

They want to know, is this real or is this not, because they begin right now the process of hiring teachers to begin next fall. They do not want to hire a teacher, find out we did not really mean it last October, and make that commitment. They want to know whether we stand there ready, confirmed, and committed to this process. That is why it is so critical that we go on the record now with the class size authorization bill.

I hope to offer that today. I am looking forward to working with my Republican colleagues, again, in a bipartisan effort to let our school boards know we are with them in this critical process. We will obviously have other times to talk about this, certainly in the appropriations committees, as we did last year. I know we will have a big discussion on it in the budget. It is extremely important that we make this kind of commitment now.

I have heard my colleagues from the Republican side say that Ed-Flex needs to go cleanly right now, because it is bipartisan and because it is timely. The same goes for class size reduction. It is timely, so school boards can make those commitments, and it is bipartisan, if we all believed what we said and how we voted last October.

I really hope I can work with my Republican colleagues to, again, put this amendment up this afternoon or whenever the majority leader agrees, have a time commitment to it. I am willing to negotiate that. If it can be done quickly, that is fine by me. We need to have an up-or-down vote on this amendment, and we need to do it as quickly as possible.

I, too, want the Ed-Flex bill to pass. This is an amendment I think is critical and important and timely, and I hope to work with my Republican colleagues to make sure it happens today. I am looking forward to our discussion, which will begin in about a half hour. I hope to offer my amendment and to work with all of our colleagues on the floor to send a message that we do believe in this U.S. Senate that reducing class size in 1 through 3 is a commitment we can and should make.

KNOW-YOUR-CUSTOMER AMENDMENT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, on Friday, an amendment was offered to the Ed-Flex bill to block implementation of certain regulations which the banking regulators had proposed for financial institutions to establish Know-Your-Customer programs. That amendment is still pending before the Senate. On Friday, my colleague from the Banking Committee, Senator SARBANES, made a number of thoughtful comments about