

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION OF SENATORS MIKULSKI AND BROWNBACK FOR TRAVEL FROM JAN. 6 TO JAN. 9, 2001—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dr. Lloyd J. Ogilvie: Italy	Lire		863.26						863.26
Rob Wasinger: Italy	Lire		700.04						700.04
Delegation Expenses: ¹ Italy	Lire					13,888.97			13,888.97
Total			7,685.58			13,888.97			21,574.55

¹ Delegation expenses include direct payments and reimbursements to the Department of State and the Department of Defense under authority of sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by sec. 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

TRENT LOTT, Majority Leader,
TOM DASCHLE, Democratic Leader,
Mar. 31, 2001.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). Morning business is closed.

BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

An original bill (S. 1) to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Pending:

Jeffords amendment No. 358 in the nature of a substitute.

Craig amendment No. 372 (to amendment No. 358), to tie funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improved student performance.

Kennedy modified amendment No. 375 (to amendment No. 358), to express the sense of the Senate regarding, and to authorize appropriations for title II, part A, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, with respect to the development of high-qualified teachers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I welcome the opportunity to be back on this extremely important piece of legislation on which many of us, on both sides of the aisle, have worked on these past weeks. With the leadership of President Bush, we have made every kind of effort, because of the importance of education, to try to find common ground.

We remember very well the debates and discussions we had a little over a year ago when we were at such odds and unable to move ahead with the reauthorization bill. The other side wanted to abolish the Department of Education. How far we have come. Now we are together with a unanimous vote out of our Committee to move this reauthorization bill forward, although there are those who still have some concerns about the legislation they have spoken to in these past days and will speak to as we continue to debate this legislation over the course of this

week and I expect coming into next week as well.

We all understand this legislation is really about our future. It is called the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but it really is a recognition that we have 20 percent of our children in this country living in poverty and about 50 percent of those are eligible for coverage by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

We are trying to bring some focus and attention to these children in their early years so they will be able to be a part of the great American dream. We recognize if they do not get off to a Head Start or Early Start or Smart Start, and they are not qualified when they go to school, not able to learn, it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for them to go through the education system and continue to develop skills in college or afterwards, or in alternative training programs, and be a part of a new economy in the United States and throughout the world.

All of us understand that in many respects, of all the things we are going to do this year, this debate will say more about what kind of country we are going to be in 10 or 15 years than anything else we do. This debate is about the future. This is about our children. This is about the seriousness with which we, at this time in American history, are prepared to invest in those children to give them the opportunity to be a part of our society.

We cannot knock down all the walls of unfairness in our society, but one thing we know for sure: If a child does not start off with the ability to learn and is not challenged in those early years of education, it is difficult to believe they will be equipped to play a meaningful role in our society.

In many respects this is a defining issue. It is a defining value of our country. Do we really believe in equality for our people? All Americans understand the very special role of public education in our society and what a difference it has made to our greatness as a nation. We, in each generation, have to find ways to make sure that playing field is going to be fair and equal and that those children who will be coming

up all across this Nation, and their families, can have confidence in our public school system. That ought to be generally applicable for children from homes of every income, but we all understand children who come from economically challenged situations are facing additional problems.

We have tried to work together on these challenges. We have legislation that reflects the best judgment of those on the other side of the aisle as well as this side of the aisle. We are prepared to see this legislation move forward. As we go through this week, we will consider changes on the legislation, but we are prepared to see this legislation move forward. It has important provisions on accountability. It has accountability for schools, it has accountability for parents, it has accountability for children. It provides some resources to make those services available.

But if there is one overwhelming flaw in this legislation—and it is an overwhelming flaw—it is that after all is said and done about the importance of this legislation, we are failing to give the life to the legislation which it is capable of providing to so many of the children because we are not providing the services contemplated in this legislation to all the children who need it. We will not be providing the services to the children, about which those who talk about this legislation too frequently and glibly talk.

We have to provide support for needy children. We have to do it by providing resources. You cannot have education on the cheap. You cannot have an education budget that is a tin cup budget. We have to invest in our children. That is what this debate is about, investing in our children.

It is important for the country, as we are debating these issues, to understand exactly what we have done and what we have not done. The good news is that the Senate, in a bipartisan way last Friday, with the strong bipartisan leadership from Senators HARKIN and HAGEL, agreed to ensure that the Federal Government is going to meet its responsibilities to local communities and, most important, to disabled children in our communities. What a help

that is going to be for millions of children. Full IDEA funding necessary will be available for children with disabilities. That is the guarantee that was made more than 25 years and never lived up to. Only a third of full funding was provided. Now we will be able to help every child with a disability.

In a very positive way in another very important bipartisan effort, Senator DODD and Senator COLLINS made the compelling case that if we are going to provide assistance to needy children under the Title I program, then we ought to provide it to every needy child.

We have been unable to get a similar commitment from the administration, from the President of the United States, on the funding of the Title I program. The initiatives provided by the President are inadequate to even get to 50 percent of the children, let alone 100 percent of the children, even though in the underlying legislation we effectively promise a fair chance at proficiency to all children, under the Title I program.

That is enormously troublesome. If we do not provide the funding, which we are strongly committed to on this side of the aisle—and with notable recognition of a number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have supported those efforts—then, frankly, this legislation may become just a cliché. It will be just a cliché for two-thirds of the children who are eligible for Title I, but who do not receive full services.

Someone watching this debate over recent times must wonder what happened here in the Senate. If they watched the debate on the budget a few weeks ago, they saw the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN, talk about having some \$250 billion of tax reductions that would go to support increased education funding.

That passed overwhelmingly. I think that was a very clear indication about the priorities in the Senate and the priorities across this country.

We are taking less than 10 percent of the tax break, which has a great percentage going to the wealthiest individuals, and saying, let's fund the Early Start Program, the Smart Start Program, and the Head Start Program. Head Start is only funded at a 40 to 45 percent level, and in some of the poorest areas of this country, only 25 percent of eligible children can be served because of inadequate funding. These are eligible children about which we are talking. Their parents want them to be able to get the Head Start Program. And they are told, no. Why? Because we are making a judgment in this body that the reduction in the tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals ought to have a preference over children who are in some of the most challenging and difficult circumstances.

Under the Harkin amendment, we effectively have full funding for the Head

Start Program. We would have substantial funding increases in the Title I program. We would provide more help and assistance under the Pell Grant program for children who are academically gifted and talented, but don't have the resources to afford colleges.

The Harkin amendment was a real indication of our Nation's priorities. What happened to it? We will see on the budget bill that comes back from the House of Representatives. We can ask ourselves: Did the Republican leadership consider the vote on the floor of the Senate of \$250 billion for education? Did they include \$200 billion? No, they didn't include \$200 billion. Did they include \$150 billion? No, they didn't include \$150 billion. Did they have \$100 billion? No. Fifty billion dollars? No. Twenty-five billion dollars? No. Five billion dollars? No.

Zero, Mr. President; zero.

That comes directly from the White House. We wouldn't have that unless the White House had given those instructions. Republican leadership and the White House—zero for education funding increases.

We have had debates about money isn't everything. We have had it said that money is not going to solve all of these problems. We are going to have a modest increase in terms of the budget over future years. Next year it is going to be an increase of 5 percent on the budget.

That was interesting to me because we have seen what has been the increase in education over the period of the last 5 years. It has gone up 12.8 percent a year in the last 5 years at a time even when we had sizable deficits—12.8 percent in the last 5 years.

Now we have a new sense and a new administration that says education is a top priority important? And what is their increase for the next year? Their figure is 3.6 percent for 2002.

How did we get that amount of money? That amounts to \$1.8 billion.

That is \$1.8 billion they didn't have last year. Where did they get the \$1.8 billion? It might be of some interest the Republican budget cuts job training by \$541 million. The job training program is the result of a bipartisan effort that Senator JEFFORDS was a part of, led by Senator Kassebaum, myself, and others, in order to consolidate 126 job training programs into 12 different agencies with one-stop shopping. It had the broad support from the trade union movement and from the business community. It is to try to continue skilled training for workers who need it. No. No. We need \$1.8 billion in education. We take \$541 million out of job training.

Early learning opportunities—this is, again, a bipartisan program. Senator JEFFORDS and Senator STEVENS were very involved in that; my colleagues, Senators DODD and KERRY, very much involved in this, with perhaps a very

small appropriations. That is with the recognition that study after study says that ages 1 to 3 are enormously important for children, and the early interventions from the ages of 1 to 3 to give support to children prior to the time they are even thinking about going to Head Start. That was all zeroed out in the Republican budget.

Pediatric graduate medical education cut. \$35 million to train who? Pediatricians. Who do they care for? Children. Yes. They got a cut. They should have gotten an increase, because that has been one aspect of medical training of professionals that has gotten no help until recent years.

I applaud the previous administration in recognizing that. I want to make sure we are going to have the best pediatric specialists in the world to take care of our children.

We have taken \$35 million from the EPA clean water fund; \$497 million from renewable energy; \$156 million from the National Science Foundation; and \$200 million from the National Science Foundation.

Talking about math and science, on the one hand, the National Science Foundation is supposed to be trying to help develop national policies to help our country deal with math and science. We are taking \$200 million out of that. FEMA disaster relief cut \$270 million; community policing cut \$270 million.

They are cutting all of those programs and putting them up for the increase in the education next year.

This is not the kind of endorsement for education that I think most of the American people were expecting when we heard during the President's campaign that education is a top priority.

Let's look at the out years of the Republican budget. If we pass this budget, this budget has a zero increase in 2003, a zero increase in 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 in the area of education. Zero.

What are we supposed to believe? I was absolutely startled when I saw that. I thought, well, maybe they are not going to give us all the money we need in order to cover all Title I children. But at least they will do it a little bit—maybe not as fast as I would like to do it, or virtually everyone on this side of the aisle wants to do it. Every Democrat has supported our proposal to provide Title I services to every eligible child within a 5-year period. We are unanimous on that. But, no, the Republican budget provides zero in fiscal year 2003, and zero every single year, all the way out for the life of their ten year budget bill.

Nothing is in there in terms of the poorest of the poor children—zero, nothing; nothing in there for any expansion of the Pell grants. Nothing is in there in terms of expansion of Head Start. Nothing is in there in terms of children with disabilities. But there is

plenty—\$1.2 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthiest individuals.

How many times do we have to come back to the Senate and say, no, that isn't where the American people are. We are in a bipartisan saying, no. Education is the key. Education should be our top budget priority.

But around here, you find out that this is what talks. Money may not be the answer to all the problems in education, but it is a clear indication of where a nation's priorities are.

It is as simple as that. You will hear from many friends over here that money doesn't solve problems. You keep adding money they say, and too often children still will not make progress. Well, money is not going to solve all of our education problems. But when you follow the money, you can see where a nation's priorities are, and where they are prepared to invest in terms of the future.

This is a shocking budget that absolutely fails the children in this country.

I hope this will be defeated on that basis and that basis alone.

Many of our colleagues, hopefully, are not going to have it both ways—vote for increases on the floor of the Senate, and then vote on the budget for irresponsible tax cut for the wealthy. You have my vote on the Senate floor: That is how I stand on education. Here is my vote. And you have my vote on the budget. That shows how I stand on taxes.

I can remember very well a true story from when I first came to the Senate. In my first week in the Senate, I listened to my colleague, Willis Robertson, a Senator from Virginia. He gave an impassioned plea in favor of an issue. When the time came to vote, he voted in opposition to it. I said: Willis, you gave a speech in favor on the floor, and I supported it. He said: In my State on this issue the people are evenly divided. For those who favor it, I send my speech. For those who oppose it, I send my vote. That was 40 years ago. I hope we are not going to see that again. People laugh about it—and they should laugh about it—but it will be a sad thing if that is what Senators do on education this year.

What are we trying to do on investing? This is what we have been trying to do with children who have disabilities. Under the Republican budget, their proposal will cover 825,000 children this year, and it will be the same number 10 years from now. It will be different children, but it will be the same total: 825,000 children—no increase.

Under the Democratic proposal, we are raising that up to cover the 5.5 million. We are saying that no child with a disability should be left behind. We want our President to join us. We do not want him on the outside of this debate. We want him to join us. We want

him to lead the bipartisan effort in the Senate and the bipartisan effort across the country. We want him out in front on this. But if you are going to get out in front, you are going to have to support the kind of investments about which we have been talking.

Low-income children: We have about 10.3 million children who are eligible for Title I. Under the administration's budget, for the next fiscal year there will be 3.7 million covered; and in fiscal year 2011, the same 3.7 million children. There will be no increase whatsoever. We increase it—almost double it—next year under the Dodd-Collins amendment; and then we phase in and reach the whole 10.3 million children by fiscal year 2011. We get the greatest bulk of those children covered within 5 years from now. I think it is the appropriate way to do it. I would like to do it even somewhat faster, but we were able to have an overwhelming vote, in excess of two-thirds of the Members, for that Dodd-Collins commitment.

We see how the Republican budget shortchanges children in another area: limited-English-proficient children. In this country, we are benefitting in so many different ways from those who come from different cultures and different traditions. The children are trying to make their way through our school systems. We find in the Republican proposal, 699,000 children are provided help in 2002. The same number of children, 699,000, are covered in 2011. In 2002, we ramp it up to 1.5 million children; and by 2011, serve all 2.6 million limited English proficient children.

I want to mention one of the important areas we will be voting on tomorrow, and that is in relation to professional development. We have 750,000 teachers teaching poor children who are hard working, decent, wonderful people, but do not have all of the background and competency in the areas in which they are teaching. They need additional training. This is aside from the continuation of professional development, an ongoing responsibility.

In the legislation, we say in 4 years that half of all the children in Title I will have well-qualified teachers, but we do not provide the resources for it. So we have pending an amendment that I and others have offered to make sure we are going to be able to reach those 750,000 teachers.

How are we going to expect children to take tests and measure up on the tests when they are not going to have teachers who can teach their subject matter properly? It just does not make a great deal of sense. You have to have a well-qualified teacher.

We know there is \$137 billion of need out there in terms of school repairs. We do not expect the Federal Government to pick up all of the cost, but we ought to be able to at least do our part. The Harkin amendment, which provides \$1.6 billion this year, is a good departure

point, but it is not in the underlying bill. I wish it were. If I had drafted it, it would be in the bill. There are others who did not want it in the bill, but we are going to see an amendment from the Senator from Iowa to try to make sure we are going to provide the construction. There is nothing in this Republican budget for school repair. We believe there should be a modest school construction amendment.

After-school opportunities: There are 7 million children between the ages of 8 and 13 who go home alone every single day. As this body knows, if you take out the various charts, you can show the increased escalation in terms of violence in society from children getting into trouble and also the increase in contact with alcoholism and antisocial behavior.

We know the important role that after-school programs play in connection with schools and educational centers to provide an atmosphere where children can receive additional kinds of help and assistance in the afternoon. The Boys and Girls Clubs are excellent examples such as in my own city of Boston. We know the difference they make.

In the Republican proposal, there are only 1.1 million children who get assistance in 2002; and in fiscal year 2011, there will still be only 1.1 million children who get assistance. Under our proposal, 1.5 million children will get assistance in 2002—a very small increase, but we are going in the right direction—and then afterschool programs would be available to virtually all latchkey children.

We would be developing the after-school program and have good teachers, good mentoring, and doing something about the school construction, and having support for the early interventions with children, good funding for the Head Start Programs, the consolidation of the computers, and doing something about the curriculum, and then the accountability, finding out what the children don't know, and giving the help in the supplementary services to those children so they can make progress. We would give help, making these programs available to them afterwards; not using tests as punishment, but using them as ways for educators to understand where these children are falling out and falling behind.

It is a pretty good check on some of the schools as well to find out which schools are working and getting that information back to the parents so the parents understand what is going on and can tell which schools are working. Then they can do some things about it.

This is what we are talking about. I am enormously distressed about what we are looking at in this budget that has been proposed.

We want to make it crystal clear that we are going to continue to battle during this authorization for investments in children. I am hopeful we can

resist this budget when it comes, but if we do not, we are going to have the tax program coming in several weeks and we will have an opportunity again to battle to make education a priority in this nation's budget.

We know we have people in this body who are prepared to support us. We are putting this Congress, this President, on notice that this fight will not end until we make funding education a top priority. We are either going to get the commitment from the Administration that they are going to fund education or we are going to be back here when the specifics of the tax program are debated. We are going to come back when the Appropriations bills come out.

I have been around here enough to know how important the budget can be and not be when it comes to the will of the Senate. We are going to be right back here on the appropriations. This is going to be a long, continuing, ongoing battle and one in which I am absolutely convinced we will be successful. We are just expressing the sense of the American people.

Mr. President, at this time I would like to offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent to set them aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 378 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358
(Purpose: To provide for class reduction programs)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator MURRAY and ask that it be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for Mrs. MURRAY, proposes an amendment numbered 378 to amendment No. 358.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

AMENDMENT NO. 379 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator MIKULSKI on community technology centers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for Ms. MIKULSKI, for herself and Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 379 to amendment No. 358.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the establishment of community technology centers)

On page 245, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

"Subpart 1—21st Century Community Learning Centers

On page 245, line 15, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 245, line 18, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 246, line 13, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 249, line 11, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 249, line 16, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 249, line 18, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 250, line 16, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 250, line 23, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 251, line 2, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 251, line 22, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 251, line 25, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 252, line 13, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 252, line 15, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 252, line 20, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 252, line 23, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 254, line 2, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 254, line 12, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 254, line 15, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 255, line 3, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 256, line 24, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 257, line 1, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 257, line 12, strike "part" and insert "subpart".

On page 257, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"Subpart 2—Community Technology Centers

"SEC. 1611. PURPOSE; PROGRAM AUTHORITY.

"(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this subpart to assist eligible applicants to—

"(1) create or expand community technology centers that will provide disadvantaged residents of economically distressed urban and rural communities with access to information technology and related training; and

"(2) provide technical assistance and support to community technology centers.

"(b) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized, through the Office of Educational Technology, to award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements on a competitive basis to eligible applicants in order to assist such applicants in—

"(A) creating or expanding community technology centers; or

"(B) providing technical assistance and support to community technology centers.

"(2) PERIOD OF AWARD.—The Secretary may award grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements under this subpart for a period of not more than 3 years.

"(3) SERVICE OF AMERICORPS PARTICIPANTS.—The Secretary may collaborate with the Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation for National and Community Service on the use of participants in National Service programs carried out under subtitle C of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 in community technology centers.

"SEC. 1612. ELIGIBILITY AND APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.

"(a) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—In order to be eligible to receive an award under this subpart, an applicant shall—

"(1) have the capacity to expand significantly access to computers and related services for disadvantaged residents of economically distressed urban and rural communities (who would otherwise be denied such access); and

"(2) be—

"(A) an entity such as a foundation, museum, library, for-profit business, public or private nonprofit organization, or community-based organization;

"(B) an institution of higher education;

"(C) a State educational agency;

"(D) a local education agency; or

"(E) a consortium of entities described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), or (D).

"(b) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—In order to receive an award under this subpart, an eligible applicant shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, and containing such information, as the Secretary may require. Such application shall include—

"(1) a description of the proposed project, including a description of the magnitude of the need for the services and how the project would expand access to information technology and related services to disadvantaged residents of an economically distressed urban or rural community;

"(2) a demonstration of—

"(A) the commitment, including the financial commitment, of entities such as institutions, organizations, business and other groups in the community that will provide support for the creation, expansion, and continuation of the proposed project; and

"(B) the extent to which the proposed project establishes linkages with other appropriate agencies, efforts, and organizations providing services to disadvantaged residents of an economically distressed urban or rural community;

"(3) a description of how the proposed project would be sustained once the Federal funds awarded under this subpart end; and

"(4) a plan for the evaluation of the program, which shall include benchmarks to monitor progress toward specific project objectives.

"(c) MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.—The Federal share of the cost of any project funded under this subpart shall not exceed 50 percent. The non-Federal share of such project may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including services.

"SEC. 1613. USES OF FUNDS.

"(a) REQUIRED USES.—A recipient shall use funds under this subpart for—

"(1) creating or expanding community technology centers that expand access to information technology and related training for disadvantaged residents of distressed urban or rural communities; and

"(2) evaluating the effectiveness of the project.

"(b) PERMISSIBLE USES.—A recipient may use funds under this subpart for activities, described in its application, that carry out the purposes of this subpart, such as—

"(1) supporting a center coordinator, and staff, to supervise instruction and build community partnerships;

"(2) acquiring equipment, networking capabilities, and infrastructure to carry out the project; and

"(3) developing and providing services and activities for community residents that provide access to computers, information technology, and the use of such technology in

support of pre-school preparation, academic achievement, lifelong learning, and workforce development, such as the following:

“(A) After-school activities in which children and youths use software that provides academic enrichment and assistance with homework, develop their technical skills, explore the Internet, and participate in multimedia activities, including web page design and creation.

“(B) Adult education and family literacy activities through technology and the Internet, including—

“(i) General Education Development, English as a Second Language, and adult basic education classes or programs;

“(ii) introduction to computers;

“(iii) intergenerational activities; and

“(iv) lifelong learning opportunities.

“(C) Career development and job preparation activities, such as—

“(i) training in basic and advanced computer skills;

“(ii) resume writing workshops; and

“(iii) access to databases of employment opportunities, career information, and other online materials.

“(D) Small business activities, such as—

“(i) computer-based training for basic entrepreneurial skills and electronic commerce; and

“(ii) access to information on business start-up programs that is available online, or from other sources.

“(E) Activities that provide home access to computers and technology, such as assistance and services to promote the acquisition, installation, and use of information technology in the home through low-cost solutions such as networked computers, web-based television devices, and other technology.

“SEC. 1614. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“For purposes of carrying out this subpart, there is authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, these amendments are two very worthwhile amendments with which this body is familiar, and with the excellent presentation we will be hearing and have heard from the Senator from Washington about the importance of class size. As a former school board member and first grade teacher, she makes a case that is irrefutable. We are looking forward to at least some support on the other side.

I can remember the first year it was accepted, Speaker Newt Gingrich went out and gave a positive statement how Republicans had supported this very important breakthrough in education, smaller class size. Subsequently, we haven't been able to get quite the breadth of support on that side of the aisle. Now that this has been in effect for a number of years and is working in a number of the States and we are seeing important, significant, and positive results, hopefully we will have support for it.

Senator MIKULSKI is our leader in the Senate in terms of the digital divide. We have seen in our society where education has been a divide, and we are committed to making sure that this

piece of legislation isn't going to further that divide. We want to make sure, with this new phenomenon and new technology in terms of the Internet and the high technology, that we are not having another phenomenon that comes into our society and impacts our society between the haves and have-nots. Senator MIKULSKI has been the leading voice. These community technology centers have made an enormous difference in reducing that disparity. I know she will speak very eloquently about that shortly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I won't take the time of the Senate at this point to answer the suggestions of my good friend that we have done less on this side than we should for education. I think we have all done less than we should for education.

I will point out that during the Clinton administration, there was practically little or no increase in title I funding. They did have other requests for increases, but for the very needy they did little. Also, for professional teachers, they did little. There was the class size proposal to add more teachers. We can debate this back and forth, but we are all guilty of not providing the necessary resources for education.

I am hopeful we will go forward and pass the amendment I had, along with Senator HARKIN, to fully fund IDEA.

Right now, Senator ALLEN has an amendment and I defer to him.

AMENDMENT NO. 380 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ALLEN], for himself and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 380 to amendment No. 358.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a Sense of the Senate Regarding Education Opportunity Tax Relief)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Improving the education of our children is an essential and important responsibility facing this country.

(2) Strong parental involvement is a cornerstone for academic success; it is parents

who know and understand the special, individual needs of their own children.

(3) Advanced technology has fueled unprecedented economic growth and positively transformed the way Americans conduct business and communicate with each other.

(4) Families will need ready access to the technical tools and skills necessary for their school age children to succeed in the classroom and the increasingly competitive international marketplace.

(5) Studies have shown that the presence of a computer in the home has a positive impact on a student's level of academic achievement and performance in school.

(6) Tax relief, enabling the purchase of technology and tutorial services for K-12 education purposes, would significantly help defray the cost of education expenses by: empowering families financially and increasing education spending; allowing families to provide their children access to a far greater range of educational opportunities suited to their individual needs, and; bridging the digital divide.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress and the President should—

(1) Act expeditiously to pass legislation in the First Session of the 107th Congress that provides tax relief to parents of K-12 students for the cost of their children's education-related expenses, specifically, computers, peripherals and computer-related technology, educational software, Internet access and tutoring services; and

(2) That such tax relief would not apply toward the cost of private school tuition.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, having listened to the impassioned words of the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, and knowing the great leadership that he and Senator JEFFORDS, chairman of the HELP Committee, have provided on education, it is very good for the American people to recognize how important education is to those of us at the Federal level. Education is not just a Federal responsibility; it is primarily a State and local responsibility.

The actions that have been taken so far and will be taken in the days to come will result in the Federal Government being there to be of help and assistance to local schools, to parents, and, most importantly, to students in getting a good education. Indeed, all of us can agree that ensuring that our children receive the best possible education is one of the most important responsibilities to the people in our States and all across America.

Quality education, why do we care about it? Because a quality education is absolutely necessary for our children and all children across this country to be able to compete, succeed, and lead a fulfilling life. It is key for their future success, personally and professionally. It allows them, with a good education, economic freedom and financial security. A good education allows someone greater career opportunities and choices and mobility. It also allows them to provide for themselves financially as well as for their family. Education also is very important to society and for our American civilization

to compete and succeed internationally.

I was made chair of the Senate Republican high-tech task force. One of our key policy agenda items is in promoting education and technology. I quote from our policy agenda:

Without a workforce fully capable in math, science and computing skills, our competitiveness is at risk. Without a consumer base able to utilize the latest technological advances, our economic growth may wane. The task force believes that a top priority in education should be the development of policies that encourage the use of technology.

I speak as a father. I speak with my previous experience as Governor and also as a candidate with certain promises I made to the people of Virginia, should I be elected, in the area of education. We talked about the need for more teachers, allowing the localities to determine what those needs would be as far as funding for teachers, whether they use increased salaries for existing teachers, pay stipends for math and science teachers; whether it is hiring more teachers; that is important to reduce class size so children in the early grades get more individualized attention. There is action, activity so far on this measure and will be in the days to come to improve it.

The early reading initiative, which we started in Virginia, is part of the package. It is very important to make sure youngsters at the earliest grades—kindergarten, first and second—are reading at speed. Of all the academic subjects, nothing is more important than reading. We have testing in Virginia, as do many other States. Testing and standards are very important for identification of children who need additional help as well as giving parents a school performance report card.

I agree with the outstanding amendments Senator JEFFORDS put forth last week to make sure the Federal requirement of testing in a couple subjects would not become an unfunded mandate. What we ought to do is empower and help local schools, certainly not add unfunded mandates. Senator JEFFORDS' leadership in that regard was essential, and, fortunately, it passed overwhelmingly.

Another good thing about this measure so far is that it seems the Federal Government is trusting localities and States with greater flexibility to identify what their specific needs are in that particular school district. That is important.

Now, in addition to all of this, the President has gotten involved, so obviously it has been a priority. The House and Senate have been involved, and we have made it a priority.

As important as our local school boards and State governments and the Federal Government are, parents are important. For a good student, you will find that you need good teachers, yes, and they need to be in a good environment. But also key is good parents.

I want to take this opportunity to focus on increasing access to technology for those students in grades kindergarten through 12th grade.

We all understand, and I think the Presiding Officer today sure understands, how technology has fueled the unprecedented growth and transformed the way Americans conduct business and communicate with one another. As the global economy brings in new opportunities and greater prosperity, all families will need ready access to the technical and technological skills and tools necessary for students to succeed in a classroom and also in the digital economy.

Together schools, communities, and government have worked to bring computers to the classrooms and integrate technology into daily classroom curriculums. Classroom connectivity has soared from 14 percent in 1996 to 63 percent in 1999. When I was Governor, we finally were able to get the Goals 2000 money and put it into Network Virginia, to connect all our colleges, community colleges, and schools. So that has been going on across the country.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides a separate funding stream for teacher technology training, which is important. There are tax incentives for companies to donate computers to schools. That is going on in Virginia and across the U.S. However, it is not enough that there be a computer present in the classroom or in a community center. I think it is great what Intel is doing with the Girls and Boys Clubs with their computer club houses. That is really good. But I also would like to see people have computers at home. Only through consistent access to technology can students develop the necessary technical skills to succeed and compete in the future marketplace and economy. Children must have access to the Internet at home so they can better complete afterschool homework. If you want the children to be able to have access to information or to do word processing, all that ought to be done on a computer at home, and they should not have to go to the school or a library or a community center.

The homework assignments are done after school and on weekends, and I think also by having the children working on computers at home, that increases their programming and technological skills. It also allows them to discover additional academic opportunities. There are some great educational software programs in geography, history, math, science, and the language arts, which all go at the pace of the student who is on the computer. E-books are coming around and that is another way of having children get interested in reading in a more easy way.

All of this, again, is gathered at the pace of the students. Studies have shown that the presence of a computer

in the home has a positive impact on a student's level of academic achievement and performance in the school. For example, a study using NAEP data found that eighth graders who use computers frequently at home demonstrated higher levels of academic achievement than those who do not. Parents in those situations became more involved with the daily assignments, and it also increases their communication with teachers through the use of e-mail.

There was a study in a New York project where children actually were given laptops, personal computers—they weren't just in the classroom and the library—and they were allowed to bring the personal computers home. The training was provided in this project in New York. Not only did it increase academic performance, but it had long-term benefits. The results were that the participants were more likely to stay in school, graduate, and go on to college.

Earlier this year, with the support of my colleagues, Senators WARNER, ALLARD, HUTCHINSON, CRAIG, and HUTCHISON, I introduced the Education Opportunity Tax Credit Act, which would provide financial relief for the purchase of technology and tutorial services for K-12 educational purposes. My proposal would provide a \$1,000 tax credit per year, up to \$2,000 per family, for the cost of their children's education-related expenses—specifically computer peripherals and computer-related technology, educational software, Internet access, and tutoring services. However, the tax credit would not apply toward the cost of private school tuition.

This proposal would significantly help defray the cost of educational expenses by empowering families financially and thereby increasing educational spending, which would mostly be on technology. Even more important, the education opportunity tax credit would improve the quality of educational experiences for students by allowing families to provide their children with access to a far greater range of educational opportunities suited to their individual needs. It would encourage parental involvement in their children's education. Indeed, parents are the ones who know their children's needs, know their names, and know their specific problem areas, and we need to empower parents. Furthermore, this idea of providing this tax relief for the purchase of educational technology would also help bridge the digital divide. It is very important that everyone has an equal opportunity—whether it is tax policies, regulatory policies, or educational and technological policies—so that everyone can seize the opportunities in this digital age and this information technology economy.

Mr. President, the amendment I am introducing today would provide for a

sense of the Senate in affirming how important it is that we increase opportunities for home access to technology for school-age children. While I am unable to offer the education opportunity tax credit to S. 1 because tax provisions cannot generally be added to a program authorization bill, by voting to support this sense-of-the-Senate amendment, we will be setting the foundation for future progress on this important matter.

Generally, I believe we are on the right track, for the most part, on educational reform at the Federal level with this bill. There is more trust and decisionmaking at the State and local levels. There are more funds and will be more funds for teachers, early reading initiatives, and protecting against unfunded mandates. This is due in no small part to Senators JEFFORDS and GREGG and other Members and the White House and leadership from both sides of the aisle.

Remember how we get a good student: You need good schools and parents.

We need to not only thank the leaders in the Senate for the good work they are doing but also make sure that we don't forget the parents. We need to empower parents to provide these technological educational schools for their children so their children have the same opportunities as all children, and also make sure that our country can compete and succeed. As we move forward on educational reform, I am confident that we will also be able to increase access to education-related technology for all children in their homes and pass the education opportunity tax credit into law.

I believe if we work on both sides of the aisle, we would understand that children need to have computers at home, access to the Internet, and the world of information that comes from having an individualized Library of Congress right there at home for our children. I thank the Chair and I thank the chairman of the committee for allowing me this time to speak on this amendment. I thank Senator KENNEDY also for yielding some time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia, who has given us an excellent understanding of what he has done. I think he has done a tremendous job for the State of Virginia. I have looked at his record and have listened to him and realize that he has made great contributions to the State of Virginia, and now he is here to assist us. So I praise him for this amendment. I will ask to have it set aside for a later vote, but I commend him for what he has done and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be set aside.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, earlier I briefly commented on the importance of having a well-qualified teacher in every classroom. We will be asking the Senate to vote for increased funding for that tomorrow.

I hope those who are thinking about this amendment will review the excellent TIMSS 1999 eighth grade mathematics benchmarking report. These are findings for the United States and internationally. It is the leading authority of what is happening in classrooms in mathematics in the United States.

It states clearly on page 7:

Research shows that higher achievement in mathematics is associated with teachers having a bachelor's and/or master's degree in mathematics. According to their teachers, however, U.S. eighth-grade students were less likely than those in other countries to be taught mathematics by teachers with a major area of study in mathematics.

It goes on to say:

The Benchmarking Study provides evidence that some schools in the U.S. are among the best in the world, but that a world-class education is not available to all children across the nation. The TIMSS index of home educational resources (based on books in the home, availability of study aids, and parents' education level) shows that students with more home resources have higher mathematics achievement. Furthermore, the Benchmarking jurisdictions with the greatest percentages of students with high levels of home resources were among the top-performing jurisdictions, and those with the lowest achievement were four urban districts that also had the lowest percentages of students with high levels of home resources. These and other TIMSS 1999 Benchmarking results support research indicating that students in urban districts with a high proportion of low-income families and minorities often attend schools with fewer resources than in non-urban districts, including less experienced teachers, fewer appropriate instructional materials, more emphasis on lower-level content, less access to gifted and talented programs, higher absenteeism, more inadequate buildings, and more discipline problems.

What have we done with our legislation? I mentioned the other day, a point of reference about the excellent book "What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future," the report of the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, September of 1996. Hopefully, people following these issues in the debate will take a few moments and read through this compelling report. It is an excellent document. This, along with the hearings we had and the representations from Sec-

retary Paige and the administration, gave very good structure for strengthening our Nation's teaching force.

We have 750,000 teachers who do not have degrees in the subject matter they are teaching. This is how we try to address that.

Part A of BEST will ensure there are more highly qualified teachers in the neediest schools because more teachers have access to high-quality professional development. We have a strong definition for a qualified teacher. All highly qualified teachers are teachers who have an academic major in the arts and science or have demonstrated competence through a high level of performance in core academic standards and are certified or licensed by the State. That is a very strong criteria to be met. We are going to insist on having a high standard and high quality teacher teaching the children.

The BEST Act ensures that professional development and mentoring activities are research-based and high quality. Mentoring support for teachers is absolutely essential and key. The continued development for teachers in terms of professional development is important. We require professional development activities as an integral part of the broad school-wide and district-wide educational improvement plans. We make sure that it is intensive, sustained, and school-based.

Those are the elements of effective professional development programs. They have to be intensive. We cannot have just 1 day, 2 days, a few days at the end of the year or a few days at the beginning of the year. They have to be sustained, intensive, school-based, of high quality and sufficient duration to have a positive and lasting impact on classroom instruction. Too often we have the one-time workshops based on the best research designed to help teachers continue to improve the practice of teaching and developing instructional skills.

The BEST Act ensures that professional development activities are aligned with State content standards, student performance standards assessment, and the curriculum and programs are tied to those standards at the local level.

That is the key. One of most important aspects of school success is the presence of highly qualified, highly competent teachers working in the development of a curriculum, teaching the curriculum, and the students are then examined on that curriculum, finding out what the student does not know, providing the supplementary services available.

That is as clearly stated in the legislation as we could. This is very important and is one of the most important parts of the bill. It guarantees funds for professional development and mentoring. To date, we have not been guaranteeing the funds for professional development.

The BEST Act moves to ensure that all teachers in schools with 50 percent of poverty or higher are highly qualified in 4 years. I welcome that language. That is putting a challenge to the Congress: Are we going to provide the resources to make sure we have the highly qualified teacher that will teach in these urban areas or rural areas, where we have the high percentage of needy children?

We are committing ourselves. If we are going to commit ourselves to getting well-trained teachers, we have to provide the resources. That is what this amendment does. It holds all States accountable for ensuring all teachers are qualified, and if we hold the States accountable, we have to provide the resources and require States to provide assistance to teachers in schools. It ensures teachers receive professional development to help students reach higher standards.

Requiring professional development helps all students, including those diverse racial and ethnic students, students with disabilities, students with limited English proficiency, meet higher standards.

The States are required to set the performance goals that include the annual increase and the percentage of highly qualified teachers that schools with 50 percent of poverty or more are highly qualified within 4 years. The States have to set their goals and know at the beginning of this walk that we are going to walk the walk with them, that we will provide the resources.

How do we expect the States to accept this responsibility if we are not going to provide the resources? We expect in their plan that the States are going to have to have accountability as well. States that do not meet this goal in 4 years will lose 15 percent of their administrative funds and risk increased sanctions in the following years.

We are asking everyone to be responsible and to be accountable. We are asking the States, the schools, and the students to be accountable.

The last question is whether we are going to be responsible. The way we are going to be responsible is supporting this amendment which will, hopefully, establish the guideposts for sufficient funds for the training of teachers and professional development.

My amendment effectively is a sense of the Senate that the Congress should appropriate the \$3 billion authorized in the BEST Act for improving teacher quality, and authorizes a \$500 million increase per year for the subsequent 6 years, 2003 to 2008. I hope this amendment receives a strong bipartisan vote in the morning.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 372

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will vote on the amendments now pending, including an amendment offered by Senator CRAIG that will deny increases in funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act if a State fails to make adequate yearly progress as defined by the BEST Act. That is the Education Act on which we are working.

This amendment by Senator CRAIG addresses a very important issue—accountability for results—the issue on which we spent the bulk of our time working when crafting S. 1.

There is already a mechanism for holding States accountable in S.1. Keep that in mind. We already have a provision for that.

In title VI, part B, if a State fails to meet its goals for adequate progress in improving student achievement, the Secretary must reduce the funds available to that State in succeeding years.

I should add that there are also accountability provisions directly related to student performance at the school and district levels.

It does not make sense to reduce the overall funding to a State, when in fact some schools and districts may be doing a good job and others are not.

S.1 targets sanctions to where the problem exists.

In other words, if one school in a district is doing well and another is not, we have focused our school improvement activities on the school that is not doing its job to improve achievement.

Similarly, if one district in a State is excelling and another is not, raising the achievement of all its students, then under our bill, the poor performing district would be sanctioned.

Under this scenario, with these school and district level accountability provisions in place, it would not make sense to reduce the funding of all the schools and districts by reducing the grant to the State.

Instead, as I mentioned earlier, under S.1, a State not making its performance goals would only be sanctioned based on the funds it is allowed to keep at the State level, not to hurt the individual district.

I can assure the Senate that these funds are very important and valuable to States, and their loss will certainly be something that States will work hard to avoid.

The Craig amendment would dramatically expand the sanctions already spelled out in the bill and would result in a disproportionate penalty, in my view.

My colleagues should not be under any illusion that only a few States will

fail to make adequate yearly progress. Of the 18 or 19 States we have looked at in an informal survey, nearly three quarters would have failed last year, and the handful that did not fail outright might do so with disaggregated data.

I appreciate my colleague's interest in driving change at the State and local levels, but I think the President's proposals, incorporated in the BEST Act, offer a more precise means of doing so in the years ahead.

Adoption of the Craig amendment, by contrast would stop dead in their tracks the President's testing and reading initiatives. I hope the Senate will resist the Craig amendment.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 382 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Mr. DODD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 382 to amendment No. 358.

The amendment reads as follows:

(Purpose: To remove the 21st century community learning center program from the list of programs covered by performance agreements)

On page 752, line 7, strike "F or".

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be temporarily laid aside.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

THE PROPOSED WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news article by Benjamin Forgey from the Washington Post dated May 5, 2001, about the World War II memorial that is proposed to be built on The Mall between the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows: