

takes some strong steps and with this amendment, it will take even more.

While it is difficult to ascertain how Title I funds are always being used, we do know of a few examples that raise questions in my mind:

In Alabama, according to the Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights, "dipped into Title I to pay the electric bill and for janitorial services."

While most of Title I's \$8 billion appear to be spent on instruction, the Los Angeles Times, in a March 12, 2000 editorial, said, "About half that amount is wasted on unskilled though well-meaning teacher aides, who are often more babysitter than instructor."

Title I has been used "to pay for everything from playground supervisors and field trips to more time for nurses and counselors," according to the San Diego Union-Tribune, March 16, 2000.

California school officials have told my staff that Title I has been used for pay for clerical assistants in school administrative offices, payroll staff, truant officers, schoolyard duty personnel, school bus loading assistants, "curriculum coordinators," "compliance," attending conferences, and home visits.

By offering this amendment, I am not suggesting that Title I funds are being wasted across the board.

In fact, an August 2000 report by the Department of Education says, "Most—77 percent—of Title I funds were used for instructional resources," for example, to hire teachers and to provide instructional materials. That is good.

But that report also says, that 12 percent of funds or \$835 million in 1998, were used for "program administration." Since this report does not provide more specificity, it is difficult to tell exactly what these funds were used for, but I do think we have to question whether we want \$835 million spent on administration of this program.

Another report, a draft by the Citizen Commission on Civil Rights, found that in the Fresno, California, school districts, "15 percent [of Title I funds remains in the district office." It goes on to say that funds are also used for "supplies, two case workers, Saturday schools, and breakfast and lunch programs for about 800 homeless students." This is just one example and while these uses probably most certainly contribute to a child's education, it is my view that Title I cannot do everything.

That is why I am trying to better focus Title I funds on academic instruction, teaching the fundamentals and helping disadvantaged children achieve.

Federal funding is only seven percent of total funding for elementary and secondary education and Title I is even a smaller percentage of total support for public schools. We must get the most that we can educationally for our limited dollars. It is time to better di-

rect Title I funds to the true goal of education: to help students learn. This is one step toward that goal.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I have no request for time on the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent the amendment be set aside.

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak for 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I make a point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask consent to speak in morning business for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### ENERGY POLICY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, tomorrow I believe Vice President CHENEY will be releasing details of an energy plan he has worked on for some long while. All of us anxiously await release of that plan, so we can begin discussing what kind of an energy policy this country needs.

I think it is the case that with respect to both Republican and Democratic administrations, for many years this country has not had a satisfactory energy plan. We have become more and more reliant on foreign sources of energy. We seem not to have a consistent plan that tracks over a long period of time relating to production and conservation and renewables.

So I think it is quite clear we need a new plan. We need a new strategy, one that works for this country. We have Americans today who discover, when they drive up to the gasoline pumps, that the price of gas has increased dramatically. In some parts of the country, people are now paying over \$2 a gallon for gasoline. In other parts of the country, the price of gasoline, they say, will probably move to \$3 a gallon

at some point. Lord only knows what the new projections will be.

Those who are trying to heat their homes with natural gas, or family farmers who are going into the field with anhydrous ammonia fertilizer, 80 percent of which is natural gas, are discovering the price of natural gas has spiked and skyrocketed. In many parts of the country, the price of natural gas is double what it used to be, and in some cases is much more than that.

If you happen to live in California at the moment, you discover that the price of electricity has dramatically increased. We know that 2 years ago, the price of power in California cost consumers \$7 billion. Two years later, it is \$70 billion in California, which is nearly a tenfold increase. Those price increases have spread to other parts of the west, as well.

We know that in California the use of natural gas to produce power in electric generating plants, in a deregulated wholesale market, has created, in my judgment, a broken market, one in which unregulated sellers sell into a regulated market in California, and in 24 hours the price of an MCF of natural gas can double, triple, or quadruple—in just a 24-hour period. And all of it is non-transparent. No one can see what the pricing is, who made the money, how much money was made. That is what is happening in California today.

I have been very critical of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission that is supposed to be regulating some of these activities, but instead has done its best imitation of a potted plant for a couple years. They have essentially done nothing because they apparently view markets as some sort of sacrosanct device which will be fair to all.

In fact, the market in California is broken. The market for power in California does not work. This is a failed experiment in deregulation. Any lesson we should take from this for the rest of the country—and, I would say, for my home State of North Dakota, is: let us not follow this example of deregulation. They call it restructuring. That is just a fancy name of saying deregulation.

In North Dakota, we have been deregulated with airlines, deregulated with railroads, and now they talk about the deregulation of electricity. Every time we have been deregulated, we have been hurt badly. The California experience of deregulation and restructuring ought to send shivers down the backs of the rest of the people in this country who have not yet had this experience.

My point is, we have an energy situation that is in chaos in this country: it is at the gasoline pumps in the eastern part of the country, and all the rest of the country; it is in electricity prices in California; natural gas prices for farmers who are about to go into the