The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE DUKE UNIVERSITY MEN’S NCAA CHAMPIONSHIP BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, pursuant to the permission given me by the majority leader, and with the agreement of the minority leader, it is my honor to have invited the Duke University basketball team, the NCAA champions of this year, along with the wives of those who have wives, and the coaches and their wives, to come to the Senate floor.

RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for no more than 12 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:04, recessed until 1:16 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

EDUCATION

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I wish to speak in morning business on the issue of education, which the Senate will take up over the next few weeks. There has been a considerable amount of discussion on this issue within the Senate membership but even more discussion within the populace in general. The President ran for election on the issue of education and how he intended to address that issue. In fact, he considered this to be the primary issue before us as a nation—the fact that he wants an educational system which leaves no child behind.

This is a goal that is laudable and which all of us should pursue. So the matter is now coming to the Senate. We have in the committee on which I serve—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—been able to produce a bill which came out of committee 20-0, a bipartisan bill, to try to move the issue of education along in a positive way—the Federal policy on education.

There is still much to do and, therefore, as we in this body take up the debate on the education policy during this week, there will be a considerable discussion of points that were left out of the bill as it came out of committee. I think it is important to note that we address the issue of education, that the Federal role in education is narrow. Most elementary and secondary education issues are addressed at the local level.

Madam President, the Duke University basketball team is a group of young men who reflect the type of athletes, sportsmen, and good citizens to which citizens of this Nation should strive. I congratulate the leadership of Duke University for producing a basketball program that excels not only in athletic ability but as a role model for our youth and our Nation.

It is very appropriate that before an education speech one should have the opportunity to meet these fine young men who set such a good example for kids across America.

The majority of funds that are spent on education are available at the local level. Approximately 93 percent of the funding for elementary and secondary school education comes from the local school districts or the States.

The Federal role in elementary and secondary school education is really quite narrow and is focused on two basic themes: One, making sure, for kids with special needs, special ed programs are funded; and two, making sure that children who come from low-income families have an equal opportunity to succeed as children who come from families who are better off.

For the last 25 years, we have pursued both these goals: special education and the education of low-income children. Unfortunately, both of these Federal programs have fairly significant flaws.

In the special education area, the Federal Government has failed to live up to the obligation of special education. Originally, the Federal Government said it would pick up 40 percent of the cost of special education. Unfortunately, as of 4 years ago, the Federal Government was only picking up 6 percent of the cost.

Due to a concerted effort by myself, quite honestly, and a number of others on our side of the aisle, the majority leader, chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee, Chairman SPECTER, and chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, Chairman JEFFORDS, we took in the issue of funding special education. We have dramatically increased funding—2½ percent, which is important to note, as we accept the President’s budget, almost 20 percent of the needs of special education. In fact, President Bush has proposed the single largest increase in special education funding ever proposed by a President in the history of this country. At least we are trying to address that issue.

The bill that will come to the floor later this week addresses the needs of kids from lower income families. In this area, regrettably, although the Federal Government has chosen to step back from the issue, it has done a poor job of pursuing this responsibility.

This program was begun 35 years ago. It is called title I. It helps kids with lower incomes get the same education as their peers. We have spent $120 billion on this program over its life. The vast majority of the spending has occurred since 1990. What have been the results? The results have been that the educational achievement of low-income kids has actually gone down or, at best, has remained stagnant. The average fourth grader today from a low-income family reads at two grade levels lower than his or her peers in that same classroom. The graduation rate, they get Federal funds. The academic ability of kids from low-income families in each grade level have been falling back. We have left a lot of children behind even though we spent $120 billion.

We have proved unalterably that money cannot solve the problem. If it could solve the problem, it would have significantly improved or we could have at least seen a marginal improvement in academic achievement.

The President of the United States, President Bush, came into office saying he would change this. He has put forward a series of proposals, the purpose of which is to fundamentally adjust the Federal role as we pursue the improvement of education of low-income kids. It has four basic themes:

First, we will change the Federal role so we don’t focus on the bureaucracy; we don’t focus on the structure; we don’t focus on the administration; rather, we focus on the child. That may seem logical. One may ask, aren’t we already doing that? No, the money today does not flow to the child. The money flows to the school system and the bureaucracy. The President said let’s look at the child and make our program child centered.

The second thing stressed by this administration and by those on this side of the aisle is, let’s give the local school districts, the parents, the teachers, and the principals, flexibility when they get the resources.

Today and, unfortunately, for a number of years, the Federal Government, especially the Congress, has believed it knows best how to educate the child in Epping, NH, or Tuscaloosa, AL, or in Cheyenne, WY. Even though we have never met the children—at least I haven’t met the ones in Cheyenne or Tuscaloosa—we know best how to educate them, so we have attached innumerable strings to the dollars we have authorized for the purpose of helping the low-income children get better educated. We have had program after program that has been categorical; it specifically says what the money should