

States a stronger leader for peace, freedom, and progress abroad.

For too long, government has supported itself by taking more of what people earn, preventing them from getting ahead, no matter how hard they work. President Reagan called it "economics without a soul" and taught us that the size of the Federal budget is not an appropriate barometer of social conscience or charitable concern. And that is why the ultimate goal in everything we are working with President Bush to do is to give this economy back to the American people.

Some say it is dangerous to push for dramatic reforms in a period of economic instability. But I believe it is dangerous not to. There may not always be an opportunity. Along with all my fellow Republicans, I say: Our goals have not changed. Neither has our resolve to rally around President Bush to meet them. Our opportunity is today. To my friends on the other side of the aisle: We are here and ready to go to work for the people who elected us to represent them.

Now we have a challenge before us that is different for me and will be different for Senator DASCHLE. Can we come together? Can we find a way to work with this President, President Bush, and find common ground even on the bill that is pending before us now, education? We have said we want education reform and we want a responsible increase in education spending. The American people said they want it, people in every State, as did the President, and so do we. Yet we have not gotten it done.

Can we come together on education? I think we can. It is going to take work. It is going to take some sacrifice. Senator KENNEDY is going to continue to push it aggressively, and he is probably going to have to cast votes he doesn't particularly like, and so am I, and so will Senator GREGG. But can we do any less? Can we afford not to, finally, make progress on education reform and take some steps for the Federal Government to be of help in improving education in America? I believe we can do it. It may take a little more time, but that will be our first test. I pledge to work with the managers and with Senator DASCHLE to make that happen.

We have a lot of other important issues we are going to have to deal with this year. Senator DASCHLE noted yesterday we have 13 appropriations bills and supplemental appropriations bills to do to keep the Government operating, and we have 59 days—estimated I guess—to get it done. It is going to take a pretty good lift. I hope we don't have 100 amendments on every appropriations bill, as we had last year. I hope we can find a way to show fiscal restraint and get these bills done.

Obviously, there are going to be health-related issues. How do we deal

with Patients' Bill of Rights? How can we deal with this important question of prescription drugs, to make sure elderly poor get the help they need? Can we come together on Medicare reform? Can we take the lead from Senator Moynihan, the former Senator from New York, on Social Security? Will we be able to really address the energy needs of this country? Will we be taking partisan positions and trying to assess blame? Will we be trying to find how little we can do or can we come together and have a real national energy policy that will, hopefully, help this year but, more importantly, will make sure we do not have this problem in 5 years or 10 years? Defense continues to be something on which we are going to have to focus.

So we have a full agenda. I do not think a lot will change. Senator DASCHLE will get recognized. He will be the majority leader, and I will be minority leader, the Republican leader.

He will call up the bills, and we will take advantage of our rights in the minority to offer amendments, as certainly the other side has. Sometimes we will offer substitutes. But we commit and pledge our best efforts to finding a way to make it work and to pass important legislation to address these issues and find the solutions that are needed by the American people.

It is not about personalities. I still believe that government is about ideas, about issues. So it is not really that important in what role we serve. What is important is what do we do for the people we serve, what legacy will we leave for the next generation.

I believe we can get it done. We have a lot of work to do. Let's get started. I again pledge to you my support and cooperation, Senator DASCHLE. I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, it is my expectation and hope we can resume the consideration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. As some of my colleagues may recall, under a previous order there will be 20 minutes of debate remaining on the Wellstone amendment regarding testing and then we expect a vote at the expiration of that period of time.

Senator COLLINS has an amendment regarding a study which will be considered after the Wellstone amendment. The Collins amendment will not require much debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May we have order in the Senate.

Mr. DASCHLE. It is my expectation the Collins amendment will not require a great deal of debate, so Members should be alerted that a second vote

will be expected shortly after the Wellstone vote.

Yesterday the managers made some progress on the bill. At least 10 amendments were cleared by unanimous consent, and I understand the managers expect to clear other amendments today.

I also say to my colleagues who have amendments to this bill to contact the bill managers so they can continue to move forward in working through the remaining amendments. My hope and expectation is that we can complete action on this bill next week.

At some point—preferably this week—we will take up the organizing resolution. But I will have more to say about that at a later date.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADERSHIP TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum for just a few minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged to the other side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GREGG. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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. LINCOLN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A 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.

Kennedy (for Dodd) amendment No. 382 (to amendment No. 358), to remove the 21st century community learning center program from the list of programs covered by performance agreements.

Biden amendment No. 386 (to amendment No. 358), to establish school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and local school systems, by providing school resource officers who operate in and around elementary and secondary schools.

Voinovich amendment No. 389 (to amendment No. 358), to modify provisions relating to State applications and plans and school improvement to provide for the input of the Governor of the State involved.

Leahy (for Hatch) amendment No. 424 (to amendment No. 358), to provide for the establishment of additional Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

Helms amendment No. 574 (to amendment No. 358), to prohibit the use of Federal funds by any State or local educational agency or school that discriminates against the Boy Scouts of America in providing equal access to school premises or facilities.

Helms amendment No. 648 (to amendment No. 574), in the nature of a substitute.

Dorgan amendment No. 640 (to amendment No. 358), expressing the sense of the Senate that there should be established a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate the rapidly increasing energy prices across the country and to determine what is causing the increases.

Wellstone/Feingold modified amendment No. 465 (to amendment No. 358), to improve the provisions relating to assessment completion bonuses.

Hutchinson modified amendment No. 555 (to amendment No. 358), to express the sense of the Senate regarding the Department of Education program to promote access of Armed Forces recruiters to student directory information.

Bond modified amendment No. 476 (to amendment No. 358), to strengthen early childhood parent education programs.

Feinstein modified amendment No. 369 (to amendment No. 358), to specify the purposes for which funds provided under subpart 1 of part A of title I may be used.

AMENDMENT NO. 465, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire has 16 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Minnesota has 7 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I hope we can proceed without a vote on this amendment. But as long as we are going to vote, let me raise some concerns about it.

This amendment comes down on the side of political correctness. One of the biggest problems we are seeing today in the whole issue of how we structure our educational system is that it is becoming extraordinarily subjective in the area of testing. The President has proposed a fair and objective approach where kids in the third grade, fourth grade, fifth grade, and sixth grade are tested on key issues involving English and mathematics in an objective manner.

This amendment essentially opens the door to the opportunity for the Secretary of Education—whoever that Secretary might be—or for States, depending on how this gets interpreted, to basically create a qualitative test based on subjectivity. It is no longer an issue of whether you know how to add 2 and 2; it is an issue of whether or not new math means 2 and 2 and should be added correctly. It is no longer an issue of whether or not English involves the King's English or English as defined by Webster's Dictionary; it becomes a question of whether or not English maybe should be created in different terminology for certain groups of folks who maybe don't speak English quite as well and therefore need a different type of English in order to pass a test.

"Qualitative" is a very subjective term. This amendment, although not

definitively defective, creates the opportunity for significant harm down the road if it is carried forward to its full potential.

So I am going to oppose it. I suspect it will pass because it has the name "quality" on it. But I am going to oppose it because I am very tired of political correctness being introduced into our educational system. I think it is especially inappropriate at the level of mathematics and English in the early grades of our educational system.

Madam President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I will take a few moments. I am a little confused by my colleague's remarks.

This amendment just says that we want to have a bonus go to the States that develop high-quality assessments as determined by peer review. We have peer review of everything. It says nothing about qualitative. It tells no State and no school district how to do a mathematics test. I have been a teacher and educator for 20 years. That is not what this is about at all. This amendment just says, first of all, that every State has to implement these tests on time. We make it clear. But the second thing it says is, rather than putting an incentive on rushing, we also want to encourage high-quality tests.

I draw on all of the professional literature and I draw on what the Secretary said about high-quality tests. They are comprehensive, with multiple measures. What are they? In addition to comprehensive, they are coherent so our school districts know they will be able to have tests related to the curriculum that is being taught—not some national simple jingo, multiple-choice test. What are they? They are continuous.

I am really saying let's not penalize any State that wants to go forward and do the very best job of putting together high-quality tests. That is what States want to be able to do. That is what we are hearing. All of the articles that have been coming out all over the country in almost every State say if you are not careful, you have tests which aren't even correct, and then mistakes are made; kids pay consequences; schools pay consequences; and teachers pay consequences.

We have quotes from people who have been leading the test movement: Robert Schwartz, president of Achieve, Incorporated, and the independent panel review of title I that just issued a report. And what do they say? They are saying: Look, we have to make sure that we don't have people rushing to attach consequences to tests until we get the tests right.

What are they saying? They are saying: Accountability for student progress is only as good as the tools used to measure student progress.

That is what we are talking about, having high-quality tests, having a bonus system that goes to States which move forward with high-quality testing. It couldn't be more simple. It couldn't be more straightforward. It doesn't micromanage. It doesn't tell anybody how to do a mathematics test. I never would dream of doing that.

I reserve the remainder of my time.
Mr. GREGG. Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire retains 6 minutes 45 seconds.

Mr. GREGG. And the Senator from Minnesota?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five minutes 15 seconds.

Mr. GREGG. Who is the time being charged to now?

I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, will the Senator be good enough to yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I rise in strong support of the Wellstone amendment. I am really kind of disappointed we are not getting, as our first action on the floor of the Senate in our new atmosphere, broad support for what is a very basic and fundamental and sensible and responsible amendment to assure that we are going to have the development of quality tests. That is all prior to the time that you get the bonus.

We have all seen this in one of the national newspapers—it happens to be the New York Times—with two front page stories over the period of May 20, just before the Memorial Day break. Let me just refer to what happened in New York City with the application of a test for some of the children there:

The law's "unrealistic" deadlines, state auditors said later, contributed to the numerous quality control problems that plague the test contractor, Harcourt Educational Measurement, for the next two years.

This is a company that has a 99.9 percent accuracy rate, and we still had tens of thousands of children who did not graduate. We had the dismissal of principals, the dismissal of teachers, and numerous children who failed to go to college.

All we are asking for is that the tests that are going to be developed be quality tests. And there are standards on how those are to be reached. For example, as the Senator from Minnesota pointed out yesterday, one of the very responsible nonprofit organizations called Achieve has done evaluations of various tests in various States. They have identified, for example, the States that are not just giving off-the-shelf testing but those that are really testing the child's ability to think through

a problem and reflecting that in the form of exams.

We are seeing as a result of that the rise in terms of achievement and accomplishment by these children. That is what is basically being asked for by the Senator from Minnesota. I think many of us have seen—as has been stated to me by the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Washington, and others, over the period of the last 24 hours, and over the period of the Memorial Day recess—the concern that many parents have about how the tests are being used in schools, in school districts, and how teachers are just teaching to the test rather than really examining the ability of children to really process the knowledge they are learning and reflect it and respond in terms of the tests.

I want to mention, just finally, this costs something for the States. You can get a quick answer on a Stanford 9. That might cost you \$8 or \$9 for a test. A more comprehensive test may cost as much as \$25. But nonetheless, we believe if we are to achieve what this President has said he wants to achieve—and that is to use the tests to find out what the children don't know, so we can develop the curriculum and the support and the help for those children—let's make sure that it is going to be quality. That is what the Senator from Minnesota is trying to do.

I hope his amendment will be accepted.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, what is the time situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire retains 6 minutes 45 seconds. The Senator from Minnesota retains 1 minute 49 seconds.

Mr. GREGG. I simply point out, this amendment is one of a series of amendments that the Senator from Minnesota is proposing to deal with testing. And the Senator from Minnesota has never been shy—he is never shy on anything—he has certainly not been retiring or shy in his opposition to the testing regime in this bill.

The testing regime in this bill is the core of the bill. The President has suggested that if we are going to have effective accountability in this country, we must have an effective evaluation of what children are being taught and what they are learning by grades so we don't leave children behind. He suggests that be disaggregated so there is no group that will be left out or normed in and overlooked. So testing is critical to this bill.

This is not the most egregious amendment the Senator from Minnesota has proposed in this area. No. In fact, in the spirit of cooperation, I suggested we simply take it. But the Senator from Minnesota decided he wanted a vote. So I think it should be openly debated because the amendment has some serious problems down the road, unless it is fixed. The reason I was will-

ing to take it is because I assumed it would be fixed in conference. It will be a problem for the testing regime.

The issue on testing, as has been highlighted—in fact, the Senator from Minnesota made the case—the issue on testing is whether or not we are going to set up a politically correct regime or one that actually tests kids to evaluate whether they know what they are supposed to know or whether we are going to set up a standard that essentially dumbs down, essentially takes the median and, when it isn't met, decides to drop it.

The bonus system is a critical part of that. The President's bonus system is in the bill and is structured in a way that the States get a bonus if they come on line with a good test early. The Senator from Minnesota is trying to gut that in this amendment. That is part of the first step of gutting the whole concept of quality testing.

So from my standpoint, this amendment, although not fundamentally bad, moves us in the wrong direction and therefore should be opposed. I would have been happy to try to rewrite it and make it more effective in conference, but the Senator from Minnesota wants a vote on it. Let's vote on it. It may be adopted, but I am certainly going to vote against it because I do not support political correctness as an element of our test regime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. In the time I have left, first of all, I want my colleagues to know I am all for accountability. I have never taken a position that we should not have accountability. The question is, How we do it?

I have drawn from everybody in the testing field. I have drawn from all the people in the States. I have drawn from all the people who are doing this work. And they are all saying: Let's make sure the bonus incentive goes to the States for doing the assessments as well as possible as opposed to doing the assessments as fast as possible.

This is just a commonsense amendment. This has nothing to do with political correctness. I think this really adds to the strength of the bill. Again, the truth is, the accountability is only as good as the assessment of the children, of the students. Let's make sure we have the best assessment. Let's make sure it is comprehensive, that there is more than one measurement. Let's make sure there is coherence and that the teachers don't have to teach to the test but that the tests are actually measuring the curriculum that is taught in our school districts and in our States. And let's make sure it is continuous and we can look at the progress of the child. This is the best amendment that, frankly, strengthens this bill.

Right now, I say to my colleague from New Hampshire, I am wearing my

very pragmatic hat and trying to get this legislation to be a better piece of legislation. The reason I want to have a vote on this amendment is because this whole issue of testing is important. I want as many Senators as possible to go on record for high-quality testing.

Madam President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota retains 14 seconds.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I make my final 14-second plea for colleagues to have good, strong support for this amendment. It is a very good amendment.

I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire retains 4 minutes 14 seconds.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I point out that there has been some representation that the President's initiative in the area of testing is not adequate. In the financial area of supporting the testing regime in this bill, there is \$2.8 billion committed for testing over the term of the bill. That is 7 years.

Equally important, what we should point out is that what we are adding are three new tests to the regime that was put in place back in 1994 when the reauthorization of ESEA occurred. We then required that States test in three grades. At that time, when we required as a Federal Government that States test in three grades—when the President was from the other party and the Congress was controlled by the other party—we put no money on the table for the purposes of supporting the States as they did that testing.

We are now asking that the States do an additional 3 years of testing on top of the three that are already required, and we are putting on the table a dramatic increase in funding—\$2.8 billion over that period.

But I would come back to the basic point of this amendment. This amendment's goal is to undermine the bonus system necessary to create the incentives to put in place a testing regime that will actually evaluate whether or not kids can succeed or not succeed.

It is part of a sequential event of amendments, the goal of which, in my humble opinion, is to undermine the whole testing regime concept. As I have said before, if we start creating a subjective or national testing regime—either one—we end up undermining the capacity to deliver effective tests that evaluate kids and what they are doing in relationship to other kids versus evaluating what some educational guru decides is the new math or the new English.

I yield back the remainder of my time. I believe we are ready to vote.

Have the yeas and nays been ordered?
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 465, as modified. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.
Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Leg.]

YEAS—57

| | | |
|----------|-----------|-------------|
| Akaka | Dayton | Lieberman |
| Baucus | DeWine | Lincoln |
| Bayh | Dodd | Mikulski |
| Biden | Dorgan | Miller |
| Bingaman | Durbin | Murray |
| Boxer | Edwards | Nelson (FL) |
| Breaux | Feingold | Nelson (NE) |
| Byrd | Feinstein | Reed |
| Cantwell | Graham | Reid |
| Carnahan | Harkin | Roberts |
| Carper | Hollings | Rockefeller |
| Chafee | Inouye | Sarbanes |
| Cleland | Johnson | Schumer |
| Clinton | Kennedy | Snowe |
| Cochran | Kerry | Specter |
| Collins | Kohl | Stabenow |
| Conrad | Landrieu | Torricelli |
| Corzine | Leahy | Wellstone |
| Daschle | Levin | Wyden |

NAYS—39

| | | |
|------------|------------|------------|
| Allard | Gramm | McCain |
| Bennett | Grassley | McConnell |
| Bond | Gregg | Murkowski |
| Brownback | Hagel | Nickles |
| Bunning | Hatch | Santorum |
| Burns | Helms | Sessions |
| Campbell | Hutchinson | Shelby |
| Craig | Hutchison | Smith (NH) |
| Domenici | Inhofe | Smith (OR) |
| Ensign | Jeffords | Stevens |
| Enzi | Kyl | Thomas |
| Fitzgerald | Lott | Thompson |
| Frist | Lugar | Voinovich |

NOT VOTING—4

| | |
|-------|----------|
| Allen | Thurmond |
| Crapo | Warner |

The amendment (No. 465), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Maine has a very important amend-

ment. She is entitled to be heard. It is on the subject of testing, which we have been discussing. The membership should listen to her presentation. I ask that the Senate be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. The Senate will please come to order.

AMENDMENT NO. 509, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to consideration of amendment No. 509, submitted by the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Presiding Officer, and I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

On behalf of myself and the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. CONRAD, as well as the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL, I send a modification of amendment No. 509 to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) for herself, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. HAGEL, proposes an amendment numbered 509, as modified.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the 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 a study of assessment costs)

On page 778, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

“SEC. 6202A. STUDY OF ASSESSMENT COSTS.

“(a) STUDY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the costs of conducting student assessments under section 1111.

“(2) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

“(A) draw on and use the best available data, including cost data from each State that has developed or administered statewide student assessments under section 1111 and cost or pricing data from companies that develop student assessments described in such section;

“(B) determine the aggregate cost for all States to develop the student assessments required under section 1111, and the portion of that cost that is expected to be incurred in each of fiscal years 2002 through 2008;

“(C) determine the aggregate cost for all States to administer the student assessments required under section 1111 and the portion of that cost that is expected to be incurred in each of fiscal years 2002 through 2008; and

“(D) determine the costs and portions described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) for each State, and the factors that may explain variations in the costs and portions among States.

“(b) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall, not later than

May 31, 2002, submit a report containing the results of the study described in subsection (a) to—

“(A) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of that Committee;

“(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of that Committee;

“(C) the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives; and

“(D) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report shall include—

“(A) a thorough description of the methodology employed in conducting the study; and

“(B) the determinations of costs and portions described in subparagraphs (B) through (D) of subsection (a)(2).

“(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ‘State’ means 1 of the several States of the United States.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today with my colleague, Senator CONRAD, to offer what I believe is the first bipartisan amendment since we have seen the change in control of the Senate. We are offering an amendment that will help Congress ensure that it provides States with an appropriate level of funding to develop and administer the student assessments that will be required under the BEST Act.

As do many of my colleagues, I want to make sure the Federal Government pays for its fair share of the costs associated with the assessment requirements of this important legislation. However, critical though it is that we have a system to determine whether or not our children are really learning, no one really understands or knows the cost of these assessments. We cannot see in the future, but the various experts have their own estimates of the assessment costs, and those estimates vary widely. Cost estimates range by orders of magnitude, and yet no comprehensive examination of these costs has yet been undertaken. Thus, we find ourselves in a dilemma of trying to estimate what the costs will be and figuring out the appropriate Federal share, but we really do not know the costs involved.

The amendment which Senator CONRAD, Senator HAGEL, and I offer requires the General Accounting Office to conduct a study of assessment tests and transmit its report to the chairman and ranking members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the Labor-HHS subcommittees, the HELP Committee, and the education and workforce committee.

The report would have to be transmitted to Congress by May 31 of next year. This would provide the opportunity to incorporate GAO’s estimates

into our planning for the fiscal year 2003 appropriations cycle.

I also note that the testing requirements of the bill do not become fully effective until the year 2005. Congress would have a full 3 fiscal years to provide funding based on the estimates provided by the GAO.

The GAO study draws upon the best available data, including the cost or pricing data from each State that has already developed and administered statewide student assessments and from the companies that actually develop these tests. For example, the State of Maine has an excellent testing system that is used in three grades. It is well developed; it is of high quality. That will be the kind of information the GAO will gather in determining the cost of these assessments. Other States have taken different approaches to testing and have different costs associated with the tests they are now administering.

The GAO will determine the aggregate costs for all States to develop and administer the assessments required by the BEST Act, and the GAO will estimate how much of these costs will be expected to be incurred in each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2008. The study determines assessment development and administrative costs for each State.

In addition to looking at the aggregate, we want to look at what the experience has been and will be in each State. We have also asked the GAO to examine the factors that help explain the wide variations in the test costs that are now administered by States. This information will help Congress determine whether it is apportioning funds among the States in an equitable manner.

The General Accounting Office is particularly well suited to conduct this study. My staff has had extensive discussions with GAO to determine whether or not they will be able to conduct this important assignment. The GAO has broad experience in estimating the costs of governmental programs and analyzing the Federal Government's role in elementary and secondary education. Indeed, just last year the GAO completed a 50-State study of the title I program, which included an analysis of the efforts of the States to ensure compliance with key title I requirements and to hold local districts and schools accountable for educational outcomes. The GAO, therefore, is the right agency to conduct an impartial, thorough study of assessment costs.

The assessment provisions in the BEST Act are intended to help reach the goal of leaving no child behind. Yesterday, a bipartisan group talked with the President about the education bill. He, once again, very eloquently stated the premise of the bill of making sure that schools are held account-

able for the education of each child, of making sure that no child, no matter what the family income or country of origin, is left behind. We want to make sure every child is learning. That is the inspiring goal of this legislation. That is why the President has proposed this assessment process—so we can assess whether or not each child from grades 3 through 8 is learning in the areas of reading and math. The education blueprint we are drafting will work only through a concerted, cooperative effort, where the Federal Government, States, and communities all share responsibility.

Senator JEFFORDS offered an amendment that passed overwhelmingly last month to provide a guaranteed stream of funding to States, beginning in the year 2002, in order to assess the performance of their students. Unless the Federal Government provides the States with \$370 million in the year 2002 and an increasing amount in each of the succeeding 6 fiscal years, the assessment requirements in the bill will be delayed. In other words, we are making sure we are matching the requirements with the resources necessary for the Federal Government to help States and local school districts fulfill the requirements of this new legislation.

The BEST Act requires a great deal from our schools and from our States. For the first time, we are requiring accountability in a meaningful way. We are requiring that all students, and in particular our disadvantaged and low-income students, show improvement in their academic achievement from year to year. We need to provide adequate funding to help States develop high-quality assessment tools. At the same time, we just don't want to write a blank check to the testing companies. Such an approach would sap the incentive of companies to develop student assessments efficiently and cost effectively.

The solution is information. We need to have solid, well-researched data to make the best decisions possible when determining funding levels to support the States' testing systems over the next several years.

Now is the ideal time to authorize a thorough study by the GAO to gather the information we need. Since States and local school districts will be in the first year of assessment development and implementation next year, it is the perfect time to gather the critical information on which to base future funding decisions. The GAO report will provide the information we need to make the right decisions based on actual State experience and the best available data and informed projections.

I urge my colleagues to support this reasonable addition to the education reform bill. I urge my colleagues to support the Collins-Conrad amend-

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment of the Senator from Maine. It is a very appropriate approach to determining how much these tests are going to cost and the best way to address them.

I think it will provide a significant amount of information which will be a welcome addition to the process as we go forward trying to evaluate how best to do these tests and how to keep them from being an extraordinary burden on the States, which is of course our goal.

The President has set up a testing regime which, as I mentioned, is really the key to this whole bill, as far as he is concerned. It is a process by which all children in America will be tested in order to determine whether or not they have succeeded in learning what they should know at the grade level they are presently attending. The object, of course, is to keep track of children and make sure no child is left behind, which is the stated goal of the President and all of us here in this Congress.

In doing that, we are clearly creating a huge new activity in the area of testing. It is appropriate we have this evaluated effectively. The GAO study proposed by the Senator from Maine is the right way to do it. I congratulate her on her amendment and strongly support it.

I yield the floor. I make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask consent the pending amendment by the Senator from Maine be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 532 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 532.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CORZINE, proposes an amendment numbered 532.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase the authorization of appropriations for certain technology grant programs)

On page 362, line 14, strike "\$500,000,000" and insert "\$900,000,000".

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this amendment I am offering addresses an issue of which I think every parent is well aware. In this debate about education, we are focusing on critical needs in American education. One of those critical needs is the ability of a child to read. We have established partnerships in this bill that will try to find new and innovative ways to teach our children how to read.

As a parent and as a former student, I certainly can recall the breakthrough in my life and the lives of my kids when their reading skills reached a level where they picked up a book by themselves and enjoyed it. I am glad they did. My kids have turned out just fine. Thanks to good teachers and a lot of prodding by parents, a lot of children go through this learning experience to read. I think it is wonderful that this bipartisan education bill focuses money on these partnerships to bring in new, innovative thinking to teach our children how to read.

The amendment I offer today looks at another challenge beyond reading, on which I think we should take a moment to reflect, and that challenge is math and science education. Think about the wondrous things occurring in America today. Think of all the technology that is being developed. Think of the fact that the United States leads the world—and we are proud of it—when it comes to the development of technology. Pause for a moment and reflect on whether or not we are training our children so they can continue this dominance of the United States when it comes to math and science.

If you make an honest and objective appraisal, you may come to the same conclusion I have come to, and that is that we can do a better job. I fully support the idea of the reading partnerships. The amendment I offer today suggests we fund for math and science partnerships at the same level of funding as reading partnerships. That sounds like a pretty simple thing. I hope it is agreed to on a bipartisan basis. It is not offered as an unfriendly or hostile amendment. I hope many will view it as a positive response to a good suggestion. Yes, let's invest in reading, but don't forget the need to invest in math and science.

Does anyone doubt the need exists? I am going to recount for a moment some statistics and information we brought together about the current state of education in math and science in America. As you listen to this information, reflect on whether or not we can do a better job, whether or not we need to make the right investment in teachers and in students and teaching techniques so we continue our dominance in the world in the areas of science, technology, and mathematics.

In too many cases today, elementary and secondary students in American schools are not receiving world-class

math and science education. Every 4 years we have an Olympics, a winter Olympics and a summer Olympics. We are very proud of U.S. athletes who compete with athletes from nations around the world. Those young men and women usually end up in the White House for representing our Nation, and they show off their gold medals and silver medals and bronze medals and we take great pride in it.

There was another Olympics which took place a few years ago, the 1996 Third International Mathematics and Science Study, called the TIMSS assessment. It was administered to students around the world in grades 3, 4, 7, 8, and 12; 45 different countries participated in it.

The U.S. students at the third and fourth grade levels scored near the top in these international assessments. Their performance started to decline when we were compared to 8th graders around the world, and their ranking was well below the international average by the 12th grade.

American eighth graders were tested with TIMSS again in 1998 and 1999 to see if there had been any change. The raw average scores were about the same as they were for the eighth graders tested in 1996. The eighth graders tested in 1999 exceeded the international average in both science and math. But of the 38 countries that participated in the assessments, students in 17 countries performed better than students in the United States in science and 18 nations outscored the United States in math. Singapore, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan led the nations that were tested in math and science. U.S. students' math and science scores put us in the same category as Bulgaria, Latvia, and New Zealand.

U.S. students today are just not taught what they need to know when it comes to math and science. Most American high school students take no courses in advanced science; 50 percent of students take chemistry; 25 percent take physics.

In a February opinion article for Education Week, the president of the National Science Teachers Association asked this question: If the United States were ranked 17th in the world in Olympic medals, it would be a national embarrassment and no doubt there would be a free flow of money to fix the problem. Why can't the same be true for education?

First, let's speak about teachers. This is the key to it. If you do not have a person standing in front of the classroom who understands the subject and knows how to teach the subject, then the child has to learn on his or her own.

Can you remember when you were sitting at a desk in a classroom? Could you have taken out that book in the classroom and learned by yourself and

gone home at night and have done your own homework without the help, the urging, and encouragement of a teacher? I doubt it.

In 1998, the National Science Foundation found that just 2 percent of elementary school teachers had a science degree and 1 percent had a math degree. An additional 6 percent had majored or minored in science or math education in college. Nearly one in four of American high school math teachers and one in five high school science teachers lacked even a minor in their main teaching field.

Do you know what that means? These are teachers standing in front of classrooms in our high schools teaching math and science who did not minor or major in that subject in college. They might be good teachers. Maybe they have a lot of talent. But it suggests that someone who has majored perhaps in English or history, standing up trying to teach a chemistry or physics course, may not have the skills they need.

Internationally, fully 71 percent of students learn math from teachers who majored in mathematics—around the world, 71 percent. Only 41 percent of all American elementary and secondary students are taught by teachers with a math degree.

I would like to have a pop quiz in the Senate for all of my colleagues. Please take out your pads and pencils. We are going to have a little math test.

A researcher at the University of California at Berkeley found that just 11 out of 21 American elementary school teachers could divide $1\frac{3}{4}$ by $\frac{1}{2}$ and come up with the correct answer. Every single teacher in a group of 72 Chinese teachers got it right. I wonder how many Senators could get it right.

High school and college students in America, unfortunately, are not majoring in math and science as they must if we are going to meet world demand for the skills to make certain that the 21st century is an American century. In 1997, the National Science Foundation found that 22 percent of college freshmen who intended to major in science or engineering reported that they needed remedial work in math, and 10 percent reported they needed remedial classes in science.

Let me speak for a moment about women and minorities in the fields of math, science and technology.

In 1996, women received 47 percent of all science and engineering bachelor's degrees awarded but just 9 percent of the bachelor's degrees in engineering-related technologies, 17 percent of the bachelor's degrees in engineering, and 28 percent of the bachelor's degrees in computer and information sciences. Women make up half of the U.S. workforce, but they account for only 20 percent of those with credentials in information technology.

The National Science Foundation tells us that African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans comprise 23 percent of the population as a whole but earn just 13 percent of bachelor's degrees, 7 percent of master's degrees, and 4.5 percent of doctorate degrees in science and engineering.

So we are not only failing to teach Americans when it comes to math and sciences, but we are leaving behind women and minorities who should be part of this exploding opportunity that America knows is really our future.

There is also a terrible shortage of technological workers. If you follow the proceedings of the Senate, you probably are aware of the fact that we debate from time to time changing visa quotas of those who want to come into the United States, particularly under H-1B visas. The reason, of course, that we are opening our doors in America for technology workers to come in from overseas in larger numbers is that we do not have the work pool in this country to meet the needs.

There is a lesson here. For Senators who are following this debate and those who are in the galleries and listening, the lesson is this: If we are going to produce the workers in America to meet the needs of high-tech employment, we can't start with a law mandating that it comes from Congress. We have to start in the classroom, and we have to start it at an early age.

The purpose of the amendment I am offering today is to say let us start investing in math and science partnerships early on so that we have a chance to produce these workers for the next generation. I think it is not unreasonable to ask my colleagues in the Senate to make an equal investment in math and science as they do in reading so that we no longer have to debate on an annual basis opening the doors of our Nation so that those who were trained in foreign schools and foreign universities can come and fill those high-paying jobs.

There is a terrible shortage when it comes to math and science teachers. The National Science Teachers Association has reported that 48 percent of all middle schools and 61 percent of all high schools reported difficulty in finding qualified science teachers. In urban areas, an astounding 95 percent of districts report an immediate need for high school science and math teachers.

I was born and raised in East St. Louis, IL. It was a great town in which to grow up. But East St. Louis has fallen on very hard times. The public schools of my old hometown struggle to survive and to educate children.

I once met with the superintendent of the school district of my old hometown. I asked him about math and science teachers at East St. Louis Senior High School. This is what he told me: We will have any teacher who is willing to try to teach math and

science. We are not going to question their background or qualifications. If they will take that textbook and stand in front of the classrooms, we will hire them on the spot.

That is just not a story of East St. Louis, IL, it is a story, sadly, across America, particularly in urban school districts. Think of a wasted opportunity. How many young men and women sitting in that classroom with the right teacher and the right opportunity can make a valuable contribution to this Nation? But they won't be able to do it if the teacher standing in front of the classroom doesn't have the skills.

In Chicago, school officials have begun recruiting foreign teachers and bringing them in from overseas to teach in the Chicago public schools, particularly in the areas of math and science. They find in some areas of Europe and Asia where math and science are really valued that these young people have great degrees and want to come to America. Once again, we are issuing additional visas so that foreign-trained teachers can come and teach in our high schools. It is happening in Chicago, a town I am proud to represent. But it ought to give us some pause to think that is how we are responding to this national need.

Let me recall the year 1957 for a moment. The Soviet Union shocked the world by launching a satellite called Sputnik. We had just started our concern about the cold war. Along comes this Soviet breakthrough in science which literally scared the Members of Congress into doing something substantive. We enacted major legislation known as the National Defense Education Act. It was maybe the first initiative by the Federal Government to make a direct investment in education. We were concerned that we didn't have the engineers, scientists, and technicians to compete with the Soviet Union in the cold war. Money was put into the National Defense Education Act. It provided funds for schools to improve their math and science courses. It provided scholarships and loans for those who went to college so they could get better degrees and be prepared to lead this country.

Why do I know so much about the National Defense Education Act? I was one of the recipients. I borrowed money from the Federal Government, completed my education, and paid it back so others could follow. Was it a good investment for America? Personally, I think so. Thousands of students benefited from it. In fact, we did not only begin the race to the Moon, but competing with nations around the world in science and technology is evidence that it paid off. We made a Federal investment that was a good investment.

The mounting evidence of the state of the world today should give us pause. Student achievement in science

and math in the United States is stagnant. Students are losing interest in math and science in high school. Fewer students pursue degrees in the math and science fields. The technology workforce is having a difficult time finding qualified workers, and it is hard to attract math and science teachers whom we need in our schools.

All of these factors must lead us to conclude that something must be done to reform math and science education in grades K through 12. This bill makes an important first step in funding national science partnerships. I am asking the sponsors and those supporting this bill to consider expanding the amount of opportunity in math and science as we have in reading. Let us not make math and science second rate next to reading. Reading is critically important, but don't in any respect forget the importance of math and science to our Nation.

We have appointed several commissions over the last several years, one of them with our former colleague from Ohio, Senator John Glenn. We all know John Glenn's story—this great American who served in the Marine Corps in both World War II and the Korean war, the first man in space, and who served with us in the Senate. After he announced his retirement from the Senate, once again he became an astronaut. What a great man, and what a great contribution he made to America; he is a person who really appreciates science and math. He was asked by President Clinton to establish a commission to look into this issue of the question of math and science.

The Glenn Commission came out with some startling findings to back up the reasons we need this amendment today. Senator Glenn came to the conclusion that if America is really going to succeed in the future, we cannot ignore the need for math and science.

What he has said in this report—which is bipartisan, bringing together some of the best educators in America—is, we need to make the investment to make it happen, to make certain we have good teachers who are well paid and kids who are well educated in the fields of math and science.

There was another commission created which reported to Congress in February of this year. It was cochaired by former Senator Gary Hart of Colorado and former Senator Warren Rudman of New Hampshire. This commission did not look at science from the viewpoint of just education; they looked at it in terms of national security. And, once again, this bipartisan commission, representing some of the best minds in America, looking in the field of national security, came to the conclusion that education was a national security imperative.

So if you are one of those in Congress who believe our first responsibility is to provide for the national defense,

then you should read this commission report and realize that a strong America, with a strong national defense, relies on strong teachers and strong students in classrooms around America who are learning math and science.

I think the message is very clear. I hope my colleagues will pause and reflect on it for a moment. We have a chance, in this legislation, to do something significant for our schools. I am happy that it is a bipartisan effort. I am happy that we have Senators from both sides of the aisle working with Members in the House of Representatives on both sides to come up with a bill.

I do not believe this is a partisan amendment I am offering. I believe there are Republican Senators, as well as Democrats, who appreciate the need for an investment in math and science.

It is interesting that when I asked for support for this amendment from around the country, the support did not just come from teachers organizations; the support came from those representing scientific endeavors, people who are on the front line in research in America, people at the National Institutes of Health, those who are involved in research in Silicon Valley. These are the people who came forward and said to me: Senator, don't overlook math and science. Make this basic investment in reading, but don't forget math and science.

We want to be able to hire American students to work in American companies to produce American products that sell around the world. I am not averse to people coming to this country. My mother was an immigrant. I have an open mind, and I really believe in the value of immigration. But if we look to the future, don't we want to give our kids the first opportunity in the classroom?

What we do with this amendment is increase the authorization level for math and science partnerships.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GREGG. Would the Senator be willing to take this on a voice vote?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes, I would. And with that kind of encouraging question, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it is my understanding that my colleague—and yours—from New York wants to come over to speak to this amendment. So at this point 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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am proud to join with the occupant of the chair, my friend and colleague from the State of Illinois, in this amendment. I very much appreciate the opportunity to speak on it. I apologize for the slight delay; we are finishing up a hearing on faith-based institutions in Judiciary, which I had to chair.

American students are falling further and further behind in math and science. The numbers tell a dismal story.

In 1996, only 23 percent of all eighth graders were at or above proficiency in math, and 27 percent of all eighth graders were at or above proficiency in science.

A 1999 international study revealed no significant progress for American eighth grade students in math and science achievement over the last 5 years. Even worse, the study indicated that U.S. student achievement in these academic areas actually declines between grades 4 and 8.

I don't have to tell my colleagues how important math and science are in this new global economy. Technology is key, and the base of technology is math and science. As sure as we are debating this amendment today, if America does not improve its math and science ability, we are not going to stay the No. 1 economy in the world. High value is added, as Alan Greenspan says, by thinking things, not by moving things anymore. We have to have the best people at thinking things. When math and science are as poorly learned and as poorly retained as they have been, there is trouble on the horizon.

My own State of New York is not immune; 28 percent of our New York high school students failed the math Regents test—up from 24 percent in 1997.

So we have an anomaly in America. While we have many brilliant U.S. scientists and mathematicians leading the way in research and technology, basic education in these areas has been increasingly deficient.

How are we going to have the next generation be as brilliant, as productive, and as important as this one has been in math and science if our schools continue to teach them poorly? We cannot continue to simply rely on immigrants to fill the brain gap. We have to have American students doing much better.

As a good friend of mine, an accomplished mathematician, Jim Simons likes to say, "For every person familiar with neural networks, double helixes, or string theory, there are thousands who cannot do long division, let alone high school algebra." That is

the anomaly we face in modern America—the anomaly that this amendment helps, we hope, to alleviate.

How do we make the change? Well, probably the most important answer lies in our teachers. Teachers make a difference. Studies tell us that teacher qualifications can account for more than 90 percent of the differences in students' reading and math scores. To repeat that, teacher qualifications can account for more than 90 percent of the differences in students' math and reading scores. But we are facing a battle on two fronts—a lack of interest in the teaching profession and inadequate teacher training in math and science.

Depression babies in the thirties and forties wanted to get a civil service job and were willing to sacrifice pay. Women, in the 1950s and 1960s were told: be a nurse or a teacher. And millions were. They sure helped me with my education. Those in the last group—my generation, the Vietnam war era of young men—were granted a deferment if they taught, and many did.

We had open school day. My children attend New York City public schools. I talked to each of their teachers. There are 12 of them—6 for each daughter in the various subjects. Jessica is in high school and Allison is in middle school. I asked, "How did you become teachers?" Half of the women who I interviewed entered in those years, and of the six men I interviewed, four entered teaching during the Vietnam war era. It was amazing.

As this chart shows, fewer and fewer talented men and women in math and science are choosing careers as teachers. Only 8 percent of the Nation's math teachers and 7 percent of the Nation's science teachers were new in 1998. It is worse in my State of New York. The numbers are 5 percent and 4 percent, respectively.

This is an amazing and frightening statistic: 28 percent of math teachers and 26 percent of science teachers in the United States did not major in the field in which they teach; 22 percent of the Nation's middle school math and science teachers are not certified. How are we going to attain excellence with these statistics?

The combination of low pay—teachers earn 30 percent less than other workers with a bachelor's degree in the same subject—little prestige, and, of course, multiplying job opportunities for talented math and science majors has led to a shortage crisis in these vital subject areas.

Let me read you this statistic, which is equally frightening: As of 1998, a quarter of our Nation's math teachers were over age 50. In 1998, a third of New York's math teachers were over 50. That means a huge percentage of these teachers from the old generations are going to retire. With whom are we going to replace them?

The shortage is particularly acute in low-income and urban communities. These communities alone will need more than 700,000 additional teachers in the next decade.

We must demand excellence from all of our teachers. We have to ensure that teachers who have spent years in the classroom continue with their professional development. Similarly, we must ensure that new teachers enter the field with the skills and knowledge base necessary to educate our children.

As last year's Glenn Commission concluded:

The most consistent and powerful predictors of student achievement in math and science are full teaching certification and a college major in the field being taught.

Last year in New York, 37 percent of teachers or prospective teachers failed the State teacher's certification examination in math—that is up from 32 percent 3 years ago—38 percent failed the biology test compared to 24 percent 3 years ago. So things are not getting better; they are indeed getting worse.

So what do we do about it? Well, the bill before us, S. 1, takes an important step in prioritizing math and science education by creating a new program to improve teaching in these critical areas. Just yesterday, we passed an important amendment which would strengthen these provisions, and I am proud to have worked in a bipartisan fashion with not only Senator DURBIN, but Senators FRIST, ROBERTS, WARNER, CRAPO, and GREGG on this important amendment.

Now, specifically, the amendment ensures that schools working in collaboration with colleges and universities use funds to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers—both recent graduates and midcareer professionals—in math and science.

We encourage local districts to use scholarships, signing incentives, and stipends to attract talented individuals to the field and to pair those activities with effective retention tools such as professional development and mentoring.

We authorize districts to create mastery incentive systems, where experienced certified math and science teachers who demonstrate their expertise through an exam and classroom performance are rewarded.

With the passage of this amendment, the provisions in this bill are a good first step, but we must ensure that we provide enough funding to make the new program work. The greatest worry I have about this bill, which I think has been exquisitely crafted by our leader from Massachusetts, working so hard with so many other Senators and with the White House, is that we will have all this great language and no money to help with what we say we are going to do.

It would be the sheerest hypocrisy to do that. It would delude the American

people into thinking we are doing something when we are actually doing nothing, other than adding more laws without implementing them.

That is why today Senators DURBIN, CORZINE, and I are offering an amendment which would increase the math and science partnership authorization—what we did yesterday—from \$500 million to \$900 million. We are pleased that Reading First is authorized at \$900 million. Our children have to be proficient readers, but in today's world, science and math are no less important, and our funding priorities should reflect that.

We should be funding these math and science partnerships at the same level that Reading First is funded. Math and science has to be a priority for our Nation. We have to recruit, retain, and reward great math and science teachers. After all, it is these men and women who are responsible for educating our children and ensuring that our Nation will be prepared to stay No. 1 in the very competitive math and science-oriented global economy of the 21st century.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. SCHUMER. I withhold my suggestion if my colleague from Massachusetts wishes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I see my friend and colleague from New Hampshire is here. We want to move ahead with this amendment.

First, I commend the good Senator from Illinois for this amendment. I remember when we passed the Eisenhower program. It was passed in 1984 after the excellent report of Ernie Boyer, "A Nation at Risk," which is still the definitive work as to where we were in early education and the challenges we faced. We have been trying to respond to those challenges from that period of time.

This legislation, as has been pointed out by the Senators from Illinois and New York, is different from the Eisenhower program in that it enhances the opportunity for recruitment, which is enormously important, and also has an emphasis on curriculum, which is extremely important, as we are finding out in the review.

In the first testing we are going to have for the 3–8 grades, it is going to be on math—science is going to be down the road, but it is going to be on math and it is also going to be on literacy. As the Senator from Illinois pointed out, we are seeing a three-fold increase in literacy but we have not increased in math and science.

If we are going to have a greater sense of expectation of the children in

literacy, because this is the area that is going to be tested, the Senator says let's give equal priority to the areas of math and science. That makes eminently good sense. It is a modest increase. It is basically going to establish similar funding in math and science, as we have on literacy. It strengthens our whole effort.

The legislation has provisions for recruitment and curriculum; this is an enhancement of that program. It makes a good deal of sense.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his willingness to accept it. It is an important amendment. It adds to the legislation. I welcome the excellent presentation the Senator made and the strong support of my colleague and friend from New York. I look forward to voting on this measure at this time, if possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 532.

The amendment (No. 532) was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHUMER). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. 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. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I understand the pending amendment is the Voinovich amendment; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Collins amendment No. 509.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I want to talk about the Voinovich amendment and a second-degree amendment that I want to offer to that, once the Senator from Ohio, Mr. VOINOVICH, has had a chance to modify his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. The second-degree amendment I will offer on behalf of myself, Senator HATCH, and Senator KENNEDY, in my view, will help clarify that we do not intend to change the basic relationship between the Federal Government and the States by virtue of this Voinovich amendment. Senator VOINOVICH seeks to accomplish a laudable goal with his amendment. It is my understanding he is striving to ensure coordination between the Governors and the State superintendents of education and the State boards of education in the development and implementation of educational policy as it relates to Federal funding.

All Senators in this Chamber will agree that is an admirable objective. The language he has proposed, however, as I understand, even after the

modification he is going to offer, effectively gives Governors a veto power over State school boards and superintendents. It supersedes most, if not all, State constitutions and laws on that issue.

The Voinovich amendment changes 35 years of Federal education law by giving the Governors of every State joint authority to prepare and prove and submit consolidated plans and applications for all of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs to the U.S. Department of Education. It would explicitly mandate that the Governor of each State sign off on title I plans which include the State's educational accountability system, the content and student performance standards, assessments, definition of adequate yearly progress, and the uses of those funds—and particularly the State's plan for identifying and improving low-performing schools.

In my view, we should not violate State sovereignty to determine how the State chooses to structure the governance and administration of education. Federal education policy has long recognized that each State sets its own State educational authority for elementary and secondary education. The bill before us does so by designating the agency or individual given this authority under State law as the person or agency in charge of administering the Federal programs. So elsewhere in the bill we do not in any way try to dictate to the State any requirement it change the way it administers its educational system.

In my home State of New Mexico, our State constitution vests the ultimate authority over education in the State school board. We have 10 elected members; we have five members who are appointed by our Governor. This board is given authority under our constitution to determine public school policy and to have control and management over our public school system. The model in our State contemplates coordination between our Governor and the board through the appointment of these five members that the Governor is directed to appoint.

The Federal Government should not attempt to undo the balance achieved in the State of New Mexico by giving the Governor federally mandated veto power over what a majority of the board decides. To do so would deprive the voters of New Mexico of the right to vote for the majority of our school board and to have that majority set policy in our State.

The impact of the amendment the Senator from Ohio is offering would not be unique to New Mexico. I am not just offering my second-degree amendment because of a problem in New Mexico. Virtually no two States use the same model for education governance. I know of no State that vests ultimate authority solely with the Governor or

gives the Governor a veto. Some States vest the authority in a State school superintendent appointed by the Governor. But in most, if not all of these States, this appointment is subject to confirmation by the State legislature.

In some States, the Governor sits on or chairs the State's board of education and has a defined role in the development and approval of State education plans. Federal provisions requiring additional signoff and approval by the Governor give the Governor a power to revise or overrule the very board the citizens of the State have established to make these decisions. In those States where the constitution vests autonomy and power in elected State boards and/or State superintendents—there are at least 13 States that do this—the adoption of the Voinovich amendment would substantially override State law and the will of the people of the State. If States want Governors to make these decisions, they can so provide, but we should not be making a provision like that in this bill as a side consequence of our other legislation.

As is pointed out in a joint letter signed by 20 major educational organizations that support my second-degree amendment, the amendment by the Senator from Ohio would allow Governors to supersede State-determined authority by requiring Governors' approval of the decisions on applications and plans assigned by the State to the State education authority.

I ask unanimous consent this letter by these organizations be printed in the RECORD.

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

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING STATE AUTHORITY IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

MAY 21, 2001.

To: Members of the United States Senate:

VOTE YES FOR THE BINGAMAN-HATCH AMENDMENT TO ASSURE GOVERNORS' PARTICIPATION IN ESEA STATE PLANS AND APPLICATIONS

The undersigned organizations urge you to vote YES on the Bingaman-Hatch 2nd Degree Amendment to the Voinovich Amendment No. 389. The Binhaman-Hatch Amendment provides that state plans and applications for ESEA would be prepared and submitted by state education agencies after consultation with governors. This will assure coordination of these state plans and applications for federal programs with state education policy and also assure that the federal government is not superimposing an education governance structure on the states.

The undersigned organizations previously have urged the Senate to vote NO on the Voinovich Amendment No. 389 because it would require that governors jointly prepare plans and applications for the entire Elementary and Secondary Education Act together with state education agencies. We oppose that amendment because it makes a very fundamental change in the time-honored separation of powers for education between the federal and state governments. The governance and administration of education is

clearly the responsibility of states. The federal government has recognized this authority in all of the elementary and secondary education acts over the past 50 years by providing that whatever each state has determined to be its administering agency for elementary and secondary education will be the agency responsible for the federal education programs. The federal government must continue to rely on that agency without imposing added conditions!

A copy of our letter of opposition is attached.

The federal government has provided that whatever choice a state makes in education governance, through a combination of elected or appointed officials, powers of state boards of education, state legislatures, governors or chief state school officers, that state determination is final. Federal statutes have not and must not overturn that determination by requiring additional authorities for governors, or other officials, not otherwise provided by the state constitution or state law.

The United States Senate has the opportunity to maintain the recognition of state sovereignty while advancing provisions in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that would encourage coordination among state officials and explicitly provide for consultation by the state education agency with the governor in the preparation of plans and applications for ESEA.

The undersigned organizations believe the issues of governance and administration are of critical importance with respect to the fundamental authority of state and local responsibility for elementary and secondary education. The Voinovich amendment is not a minor extension of authority for coordination and consultation. It is a fundamental change in federal-state relations by imposing requirements which are properly the responsibility of the states. We urge your vote for the Bingaman-Hatch amendment which truly provides for appropriate participation by the governor.

To assist with understanding of the specific provisions and consequences of the Voinovich amendment No. 389, we also attach a set of questions and answers about that amendment.

We urge your support of the amendment by Senators Bingaman and Hatch.

Sincerely,

American Association of School Administrators, American Association of University Women, American Federation of Teachers, Association for Career and Technical Education, California State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Citizens Commission on Civil Rights, Council for Exceptional Children, Council for Chief State School Officers, International Reading Association, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, National Alliance of Black School Educators, National Association for Bilingual Education, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, National Association of School Psychologists, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Association of State Directors of Special Education, National Association of State Title I Directors, National PTA, National School Boards Association, School Social Work Association of America, United Church of Christ Justice and Witness Ministries.

Mr. BINGAMAN. The second-degree amendment I will propose, along with Senators HATCH and KENNEDY, will provide for coordination between Governors and State education authorities, but it will not have the effect of superseding State-determined decision-making. Through consultation, the Governor and the State education authority will review key issues and ensure the plans and applications are consistent with overall State policy for education.

It is my understanding Senator VOINOVICH will modify his amendment to add a new phrase. The phrase is "unless expressly prohibited by State constitution or law." The modification does not solve the problem about which I am concerned. State constitutions and laws do not expressly prohibit any State authority from acting with respect to education. Instead, in my State and all States I am aware of, the State constitution affirmatively assigns responsibility to certain State authorities. They do not prohibit other State authorities from taking action.

The amendment with the modification still would have the effect of interfering with State sovereignty by giving Governors a veto power over State plans under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I believe this second-degree amendment is a better alternative. I urge my colleagues to support it. I appreciate the chance to explain the amendment at this point.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 509, AS MODIFIED

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on the Collins-Conrad amendment be vitiated, and that the amendment be agreed to by a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 509), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will take one moment to thank the Senator from Maine for this excellent amendment. There has been concern about

what is going to be the real cost. There have been wide disparities in terms of the estimates. I have looked through a number of these studies. The Senator from Maine said let's really get a definitive study so we will know what the burden upon the States is going to be so we can act responsibly. I think it makes a great deal of sense. I think it will make even more sense if we include the more recent alterations that are in the Wellstone amendment.

I thank the Senator. I think this is enormously helpful and valuable.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Hampshire for their kind comments. I appreciate their support for the amendment. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 389, AS MODIFIED

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I call up amendment 390, and I send a modification to my amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 389), as modified, is as follows:

On page 7, line 21, add "and the Governor" after "agency".

On page 8, line 1, insert "and the Governor" after "agency".

On page 35, line 10, strike the end quotation mark and the second period.

On page 35, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

"(c) STATE PLAN.—Each Governor and State educational agency shall jointly prepare a plan to carry out the responsibilities of the State under sections 1116 and 1117, including carrying out the State educational agency's statewide system of technical assistance and support for local educational agencies.

"(d) NONAPPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—The requirements of this section shall not apply to a State where compliance with such requirements is expressly prohibited by the State constitution or a State law."

On page 35, line 20, insert "that, unless expressly prohibited by a State constitution or law, is jointly prepared and signed by the Governor and the chief State school official," after "a plan".

On page 706, line 8, insert "Governor and the" after "which a".

On page 706, line 16, insert "Governor and the" after "A".

On page 707, line 2, insert "Governor and the" after "A".

On page 708, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

"(c) NONAPPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.—The requirements of this section shall not apply to a State where compliance with such requirements is expressly prohibited by the State constitution or a State law.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, throughout the course of the debate on the education bill, we have been proceeding toward the goal of bringing positive change to our education system. However, for these school reforms to succeed, we need to ensure that the parties affected by this bill are able to work in unison.

In nearly every instance where federal funds pass-through to states from highways to health care the Federal government directs those Federal funds to go right to Governors and to State legislatures.

The exception is education, where State education agencies are the direct recipients of Federal funds for education. Most of that funding is then passed on to local schools.

State plans submitted by State education departments to the U.S. Department of Education set the guidelines local school officials are to follow in coming up with their own spending plans.

However, there is no requirement for coordination between chief State school officers and Governors on how Federal education dollars are to be used in a State.

In some States, the chief State school officers are appointed by Governors. In other States, though, chief State school officers are elected.

Whatever situation exists between chief State school officers and Governors, in the final analysis, it is the Governors of our States who are held accountable for the overall condition and success of public schools. I can testify to that as a former Governor of Ohio.

As it is currently written, the Senate's ESEA reauthorization bill also holds governors accountable for student progress, even where Governors have no current discretion over federal education programs and federal education funding.

In my view, it doesn't make sense that a Governor, who has to manage his or her State's budget and is responsible for any shortfall, is not required to be consulted when state educational officers set education priorities.

That is why I have offered this amendment.

This amendment is simple: for programs where a State receives federal monies under ESEA, both a chief State school officer and that State's Governor need to sign the education plan that is submitted to the Secretary of Education.

Requiring joint sign-off on education plans by the Governor and the chief State school officer ensures agreement over the content of the State's submitted education plan.

The amendment we have offered makes sure that Federal education funds work with State education funds for the benefit of our children.

Opponents of our amendment have made the assertion that under this amendment the Federal Government would be imposing a new structure of education on the states by superceding State law.

This is incorrect.

Each State's constitution or its statutes create a State education agency that administers State education programs. This amendment does not

change State or local education policy or structures. This amendment only applies to Federal education policy. It only applies to ESEA. Our amendment would leave State governing authority alone.

Here is how it would work.

Today, nearly every State files a consolidated education plan to the Secretary of Education to receive ESEA funds. State constitutions and laws do not define what entity signs the ESEA consolidated plans.

Most State constitutions and accompanying statutes were passed long before ESEA was even written. In fact, it is the Federal Government—ESEA itself—that specifically states that State education agencies should sign the consolidated plans that nearly every State uses.

Some of my colleagues have expressed their concerns that this amendment may violate State constitutions and laws because a particular State may give sole authority for education policy to the State education agencies.

To address these concerns, we have modified the amendment to say that this joint sign-off will not apply if it is prohibited under a state's constitution or its laws.

In other words, this amendment will not supersede State constitutions or State laws. Any State that gives their State education agency the sole statutory authority to sign these plans can do so.

My co-sponsors, Senator EVAN BAYH, Senator BEN NELSON, and Senator CHUCK HAGEL, and I are not proposing to substitute State education authority with Federal authority.

As a former Governor of my State, I have fought for years to support State education authority, and I believe my co-sponsors have as well. In addition, we realize that each State's Governor plays a key role in the development of education policy.

That is something a lot of people fail to realize—that during the 1980s, and, frankly, during the term when President Clinton was Governor of Arkansas, and during the period when he became chairman of the National Governors' Association, the Governors really became intimately involved in education in their respective States.

There were education summits in 1989, 1996, and 1999. In each State it is the Governor who works with the legislature to determine key State education policies and funding priorities.

It seems logical that the individual who helps direct a State's education policy and education funding—the Governor—should have some meaningful input into where the Federal money that State receives goes.

This amendment makes sense because under ESEA we say that States that take title I funds must target them to poor students. In this bill, we state that if a State takes funds, they

must test students from grades 3 to 8. So it is not radical for us to say that if the States receive Federal funding, they should coordinate that spending so that it works with the State's education spending.

Let me remind my colleagues that Congress supplies only 7 percent of the education funding in America. This amendment only addresses that 7 percent. Why wouldn't we want that 7 percent to be coordinated with the 93 percent that are State and local funds? However, the substitute amendment offered by my colleague from New Mexico does not ensure coordination.

Currently, in some States, politics and personalities create differences between Governors and State school officers. This is again something that is not talked about in this country, but there are many States where the Governors and their State chief school officers rarely spend time together discussing education. In my State, I was fortunate that we developed a good interpersonal relationship with each other, but in many cases that is not the situation. In other words, what my amendment would do is require that the Governor sign off, unless it is in violation of a State constitution or State law.

I believe that requiring a joint signoff on education plans by the Governor and the chief State school officer enables the Governor to leverage and ensure coordination of State education funding to work with the Federal dollars Congress allocates. And the only way to fully leverage Federal funds is to ensure the coordination of those funds with State efforts.

Our modified amendment preserves State authority and ensures the coordination of Federal and State roles to promote education reform and the efficient expenditure of education dollars to the maximum benefit of our students.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Bingaman substitute amendment and to vote for what I consider to be a very commonsense approach and one that recognizes that today in our States—if we are going to get the kind of education we want for our children, if we are going to get the kind of coordination of our Federal dollars with our State dollars, and to make the maximum use of them for the benefit of our kids—it is important that the Governors of our respective States sign off on the applications that are submitted by their States to the Secretary of Education for the use of Federal funds under ESEA.

I thank you, Mr. President. With the Chair's permission, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida). The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise to add my voice to that

of my distinguished colleague from the State of Ohio on behalf of the Voinovich amendment. I do so because I believe this amendment is necessary to make the most of the historic opportunity that lies before us to improve the quality of education for all of America's schoolchildren.

This amendment is important. It is needed to make sure that our effort is comprehensive. One of the good things about the bill that has been authored to date is that it includes all the stakeholders necessary to improve the quality of public education. It includes teachers, administrators, those in higher education, parents, and others who are important to improving the quality of America's public schools.

It will be strange if we do not include the chief executive officers of the States, those who are charged with the welfare and well-being of the citizens within their States. Most of the time—the vast majority of the time—there is no more important issue for the States' chief executives—the Governors—than the quality of education for America's schoolchildren. For this to be a comprehensive effort including all stakeholders, we must include the Governors of the 50 States.

It is important for this amendment to be adopted in order for this effort to be coordinated. We will not reap the full fruits of our efforts if Federal policy heads in one direction which is completely uncoordinated and irrelevant to State policy heading in another direction.

To maximize the potential of the reforms we seek to enact, to truly make historic progress, it is important that the State and Federal efforts dovetail together in a coordinated manner to give America's schoolchildren the very best opportunity to get the education they so richly deserve. Adoption of the Voinovich amendment is important for this ESEA reauthorization to maximize its effectiveness.

I would like to observe that even with the additional funding we hope to achieve—which is so vitally important—still no more than 6 or 7 percent of the funds provided to America's local schools will come from the Federal level. Fully 94, 93 percent will continue to come from State and local governments.

We are instituting, as a part of this process, historic accountability provisions. I anticipate they will identify many schools that need substantial improvement. They will identify many students who are at risk of being left behind if we do not give them the education they so desperately need.

State and local governments will continue to be at the forefront of making that progress possible since they provide the bulk of the resources. It is vitally important that we include Governors in this process for the following reason: I have not seen a single State

education reform effort anywhere in this country succeed without the active, vigorous participation of the Governor of the State. In real practical terms, it simply does not happen.

It is the Governor who submits the State budget requesting more funding for education. It is the Governor who, very often working with the State legislature, and with the cooperation of the chief State school official, puts together the programmatic parts of any education reform effort.

If we hope to use this opportunity to catalyze meaningful reform and progress at the State and local level, we simply must have Governors involved because, as a practical matter, it is the Governors who get the job done.

As I said, I am not aware of a single major State education reform effort in this country that has been accomplished without the active involvement and participation of the Governor. That is why they at least need to be involved in the applications that are being submitted for the use of Federal funds as well.

Finally, let me say a few words with regard to States rights. This amendment does not give the Governors unfettered discretion. It does not put the Governors in charge. It simply says that Governors must work, consult and cooperate with the State chief school officers. That is as it should be if we are going to reap the full fruits of this effort.

It says to the States, with respect to their constitutions and laws, you do it as you see fit, but at least we would like to have the Governor consulted, if that does not run counter to a provision of State constitutional or statutory law.

I have been interested over the last couple of years I have been privileged to serve as a Member of this body, having been a Governor for 8 years—just as my colleague from Ohio was the Governor of his fair State for 8 years—to occasionally hear the skepticism and the concern with which some members of the Federal Government view State governments in general and Governors in particular. This is interesting, considering a growing number of Members of this body happen to have been Governors once upon a time themselves.

It was also interesting for me to observe and to listen, when I was a Governor in the Governors' meetings, to the skepticism and concern with which many Governors view the Federal Government and Washington, DC.

Surely, in the spirit of the moment, when we are seeking more bipartisan cooperation between the parties—surely, at a time we are seeking more cooperation between the executive and the legislative branches—perhaps at this moment we can seek a new spirit of federalism as well, ensuring that the chief executives of the States, working

in cooperation with the chief State school officers, make the most of this historic moment to truly have a reform of America's education system of which we can be proud and which will serve our children well.

In order to accomplish that, Governors must be involved. That is what the Voinovich amendment will accomplish. That is why I am pleased to speak on its behalf.

I thank my colleagues for their patience, and I am pleased to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the Voinovich amendment and its attempt to change the role of the Governors in Federal education policy. The amendment would require Governors and chief State school officers to sign off jointly on any title I plan or consolidated ESEA plan. As a result, the Governor would have veto power over all Federal ESEA funding and reform. For the first time, the Governor would have a veto over all Federal ESEA funding and reform.

The Voinovich amendment would supersede current State law by giving the Governor the veto power, regardless of the State constitution or current State law.

The proponent, Senator VOINOVICH, asked for a modification of the amendment and in the modification, he provides, under "Nonapplication of Provisions":

The requirements of this section shall not apply to a State where compliance with such requirements is expressly prohibited by State constitution or a State law.

Find a State constitution that prohibits activities. State constitutions guarantee. They authorize and they protect rights and liberties. But they don't basically prohibit. He is saying that this will go into effect unless it is prohibited. That is basically an entirely new concept in terms of many States.

States have made decisions about how they are going to administer their education law, and we have, to date, worked in the development of this legislation, with the language that we have that permits consulting with the Governors. But now this will change that particular provision.

The Federal Government has a strong role to play in ensuring that the neediest children get the support they need to obtain a good education. By superseding State law and giving veto power to the Governor over Federal education policy, the amendment would concentrate greater power in the government and would unfairly tilt the balance against other authorities in the States.

Under the current law, State education agencies in every State implement Federal and State education policy. We want to ensure that there is a

strong coordination among all education programs so that local schools obtain the best support available. The Voinovich amendment would distort the control of education policy in each State, causing confusion and unnecessary burdens on States and local communities.

We have all worked together to create a bill that focuses on strong, urgently needed reforms, especially in areas of testing, accountability, and targeted support for students in failing schools. We have also worked together to create the right overall structure for educational policy in the Federal system. Under the bill's pilot programs on performance agreements, the Governor is required to consult with the State education agency. That is an appropriate role for the Governor and one that I support.

I, therefore, urge the Senate to approve the amendment offered by Senators BINGAMAN and HATCH and to ensure that Governors consult with State education agencies in implementing Federal education policy. Their amendment gives the State Governor an expanded role without undermining the State law or constitutions by giving the Governors a veto.

We have seen in the past where title I programs that have gone into the States effectively have gone to the local communities. We have other education programs that go to the States and are administered at the State level. And we have respected those, the way that the States have worked out their administration of it. But this changes action in the States which the States have not indicated they wanted to change in a number of different States. We have not had any hearings on this. We don't know. We can go through the various States which this legislation would effectively override. There are many. But we haven't given that consideration.

We are glad to give it some consideration at some time, but we are effectively overriding the authority for the distribution of the resources at the State level by Federal fiat. That is the effect of this program of Senator VOINOVICH.

Under the Bingaman proposal, we are taking the responsible action of ensuring that there will be a consultation, but we are respectful. If it is handled one way in a State under the Governor, that is the way it ought to be. If it is handled under the State education authority, that is the way it ought to be.

I am just wary of the Senate overriding State decisions about how that will be distributed. That would be the effect of it. The Bingaman amendment addresses this and is the way we ought to follow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I appreciate the words of the Senator from

Massachusetts. I rise to make a couple of points with regard to his remarks.

No. 1, if we think about it, when the State constitutions were adopted, there was no contemplation at all of a Federal role in education. As a matter of fact, up until the last couple of decades, education was primarily the responsibility of State and local government. The education arena has changed dramatically.

As I pointed out in my remarks a few minutes ago, the Governors have taken a much larger role in education than ever before in this country. They started to play a role in 1983, when we had the report on the crisis in education, "A Nation at Risk." As I mentioned, it was Governor Clinton who brought all of the Governors together to deal with the challenge of education in their respective States.

Since that time, Governors have become much more involved in education. If people were asked whether their Governor would sign off on an application from their respective States for the use of Federal money, they would be shocked to know that their Governors are not required to sign off on that application. My amendment is not intended to be a veto. It is intended for the Governors who are being held responsible by the citizens in their respective States for education policies to have an opportunity to participate in putting the plan together as to how those Federal dollars are going to be used in their States.

Rather than a veto, having the Governor involved is going to enhance the application and make it more meaningful because it is the Governor who is responsible in most of the States for the budget that is allocated for education and it is the Governor who takes the leadership role.

I can tell my colleagues, in Ohio today there is a discussion going on about whether or not Ohio is meeting the standards of the State supreme court. It is not the superintendent of public education that is being held responsible by the Supreme Court of the State of Ohio. It is the Governor of the State of Ohio and the State legislature that are being held responsible.

This amendment is not going to do any harm whatsoever to what is happening in our States in terms of Federal money. Rather, it is going to enhance the utilization of those Federal dollars because it is going to require the coordination and cooperation of the Governors and the chief State school officers to utilize those moneys on the State level.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, some States have made a judgment that they want the Governor involved. This legislation respects that. In other States, they have made the judgment that they don't want it, that they want the State educational agency to be in charge. We respect that.

Under the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, he overrides that State decision. What we are saying is, with this legislation, even the State authority ought to consult.

Let me just wind up, and I will list the various groups opposed to this legislation. They make this point:

We oppose the amendment because it makes a very fundamental change in a time-honored separation of powers for education between the Federal and State governments. The governance and administration of education is clearly the responsibility of the States. The Federal Government is recognized as the authority in all the Elementary and Secondary Education Acts for 50 years by providing that whatever each State has determined to be its administrative agency for elementary and secondary education will be the agency responsible for the Federal education programs. The Federal Government must continue to rely on that agency without imposing added conditions.

Now, the Voinovich amendment does alter that and changes those conditions. That is why these 28 groups are against it.

AMENDMENT NO. 791 TO AMENDMENT NO. 389

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, momentarily, I will send a second-degree amendment to the Voinovich amendment. At the appropriate time, we will move toward a vote on these two proposals. I believe the leadership has made that request. It will be at approximately 4:30 this afternoon. I now send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for Mr. BINGAMAN, for himself and Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 791 to amendment No. 389.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 7 line 21 insert "after consultation with the Governor" after "agency".

On page 8 line 1 insert "after consultation with the Governor" after "agency".

On page 35, line 10, strike the end quotation mark and the second period.

On page 35 between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

"(c) STATE PLAN.—Each State educational agency, in consultation with the Governor, shall prepare a plan to carry out the responsibilities of the State under 1116 and 1117, including carrying out the State educational agency's statewide system of technical assistance and support for local educational agencies."

On page 35 line 20, insert the following: "prepared by the chief State school official, in consultation with the Governor," after "a plan".

On page 706 line 8, insert ", after consultation with the Governor," after "which".

On page 707 line 16, insert "fter consultation with the Governor, a".

On page 707 line 2, insert "fter consultation with the Governor, a".

AMENDMENT NO. 431 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment, and I call up amendment No. 431.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] proposes an amendment numbered 431 to amendment No. 358.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further 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 greater parental involvement)

On page 125, line 6, insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "Section".

On page 127, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(b) GRANTS.—Section 1118(a)(3) (20 U.S.C. 6319(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(C)(i)(I) The Secretary is authorized to award grants to local educational agencies to enable the local educational agencies to supplement the implementation of the provisions of this section and to allow for the expansion of other recognized and proven initiatives and policies to improve student achievement through the involvement of parents.

"(II) Each local educational agency desiring a grant under this subparagraph shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

"(ii) Each application submitted under clause (i)(II) shall describe the activities to be undertaken using funds received under this subparagraph and shall set forth the process by which the local educational agency will annually evaluate the effectiveness of the agency's activities in improving student achievement and increasing parental involvement.

"(iii) Each grant under this subparagraph shall be awarded for a 5-year period.

"(iv) The Secretary shall conduct a review of the activities carried out by each local educational agency using funds received under this subparagraph to determine whether the local educational agency demonstrates improvement in student achievement and an increase in parental involvement.

"(v) The Secretary shall terminate grants to a local educational agency under this subparagraph after the fourth year if the Secretary determines that the evaluations conducted by such agency and the reviews conducted by the Secretary show no improvement in the local educational agency's student achievement and no increase in such agency's parental involvement.

"(vi) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subparagraph \$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment seeks to help parents meaningfully become involved in the

education of their children. We all believe—every individual in this Chamber—that parents are essential parts of the educational process. Our challenge is to translate that feeling and that rhetoric into real involvement by parents in the schools of America.

We know that research has shown us that regardless of economic or ethnic or cultural background, parental involvement is a major factor in the academic success of children. Parental involvement contributes to better grades, better test scores, higher homework completion rates, better attendance, and greater discipline. When parental involvement is a priority in a school, those schools do exceptionally well. It improves not only the performance of children, it improves staff moral, and it creates and helps engender a climate where educational excellence is the norm, not the exception.

We know this through research and through our own observations. Parents themselves have declared invariably in survey after survey that their participation in the school is critical to the success of their children.

A 1999 American Association of School Administrators nationwide survey found that 96 percent of parents believe that parental involvement is critical for students to succeed in school. Eighty-four percent believe in parental involvement so strongly that they are willing to require such involvement on a mandatory basis.

However, in the midst of all of this support—our observations, the research, and the expression of parents themselves—parental involvement is something that is not found frequently enough in our schools. Over 50 percent of the parents surveyed thought that schools were not doing enough to inform them, not doing enough to involve them. In fact, they felt they didn't even have basic information about their children's studies and the issues confronting their children's school.

A recent bipartisan survey sponsored by the National Education Association ranked the lack of parental involvement in children's education as the No. 1 problem in schools today. We understand that this is a critical issue.

The finding of the NEA was echoed recently by a poll cited in a Democratic Leadership Council Update from December, 2000. This newsletter pointed out that:

Parental involvement is critical to the success of both individual students and their schools.

It concluded that we must get serious about "schooling" parents and making sure that parents understand how they can access their schools and how critical it is that they be involved in the lives of their children and how important it is that they are a part of the educational process in a very real way.

Now, to succeed in this endeavor, we have to work collaboratively with ev-

erybody. We have to get school administrators and teachers prepared to respond to parents. We have to get parents prepared to assume the responsibility of being a major force in the educational lives of their children.

For many of us, this seems obvious. But that is not the case across the country. We should recognize that. We have to prepare in this legislation to make parents real partners in the education of their children. We need to train schools leaders, teachers, and parents; and we have to make the climate in schools welcoming to parents. All of these tasks require our support, encouragement, and our leadership.

I am pleased to say the bill before us today contains many of the elements that will help us along this path to successful parental involvement. Many of these elements were included in legislation that I introduced earlier in the session called The Parent Act. These elements include ensuring that title I families can access information on their children's progress in terms they can understand—not education-speak, not technical jargon, but in terms they can all understand.

It would also involve parents in school support teams that would help turn failing schools around—recognizing that they, too, are part of the education of their children.

It would also require technical assistance for title I schools and districts that are having problems implementing parental involvement programs. Again, we think this is obvious, easy, simple. But when you go into a typical school today, you have problems such as transient populations, people coming into this country from other lands where English is not the first language, and a host of other problems—schools have to be better prepared to involve the parents.

The legislation before us would also authorize, indeed require, the collection and dissemination by the States of information about effective parental involvement programs. We know the models work, and we want them disseminated across the full spectrum of schools in the United States.

The legislation would require involvement by parents in the violence and drug prevention efforts because we know that is a critical part of the challenge today in many schools across the country.

It would also require an annual review by States and districts to look at the parental involvement and professional development activities for the school to ensure that these activities are effective, and that teachers are being trained to involve parents, and that the involvement efforts are working.

Finally, it would require each local educational agency to make available to parents an annual report card which explains whether schools are suc-

ceeding or not. These very meritorious initiatives are included in the legislation.

So I come today to say we have made some progress working together with my colleagues on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. But I believe we can do more, and I believe we must do more.

We are raising the stakes dramatically in schools throughout this country by requiring every child in grades 3-8 to take annual tests. When we raise the stakes, we also have to recognize that we have to do more to make sure these children have an opportunity—a real opportunity—to succeed and to pass these examinations.

My amendment, quite simply, would build on an existing structure of law and increase the revenue stream going to schools so they can actually implement these parental involvement programs. They can move from rhetoric to real practice, from sentiment to accomplishment. I hope that is what we can do today with respect to this amendment.

Already, title I of the existing legislation—legislation that has been on the books for years now—in section 1118, requires districts all across this country to develop written parental involvement policies and requires schools to develop school-parent compacts.

It also requires that schools hold annual meetings for parents, and it would require that parents be involved in school review and improvement policies. That is the law today, but the reality is not enough schools are doing this because the funds are not there because other priorities, as they always seem to, intrude.

Districts are actually required to spend 1 percent of their title I allotment for the purposes I just discussed—school compact preparation, annual meeting with parents, involvement in school reviews—unless that 1 percent amounts to less than \$5,000. In many school districts, this 1 percent is less than \$5,000. In fact, in Rhode Island, 25 out of my 34 school districts are not required to spend any money because the total would be less than \$5,000. As a result, this legislative standard is seldom achieved. In fact, 4 years after they were required by law, a quarter of the title I schools throughout the United States have not yet developed a school-parent compact.

As Secretary Paige testified—and he came from the Houston school system after working there and doing his best to improve and reinvigorate that school system—he indicated at the confirmation hearing that "increased assistance will be needed"—his words—to enhance parental involvement.

We know what we want to do. We actually improved the legislative framework in this legislation, but we have to provide more assistance.

My amendment, which is strongly supported by the National PTA, does

not add to these mandates, but what it does is add resources. It gives localities flexibility. It does not require what is in the school-parent compact, it does not tell them there is only one method to contact the parent, but what it says is we are serious. We are not just going to talk about parental involvement. We are going to give them the means to involve parents.

I believe this is a very powerful way to enhance education, and certainly it is a concept that no one here would argue against.

The question comes down to, in my mind, Will we give these schools the resources to do the job we want them to do?

My amendment provides the resources so parents can get more involved, as recommended by the Independent Review Panel in the Final Report of the National Assessment of Title I.

We will adopt legislation that emphasizes accountability, but accountability without the resources to do many things, including involve parents, is not going to improve the educational process of the United States.

My amendment is critical to ensuring that we can develop a coordinated focus that works in the schools for parental involvement. It elevates parental involvement from something nice to do and maybe something you want to do if the money is available to something you can and should do because the language is clear and the resources are available.

I strongly hope my colleagues will support this amendment and give to the schools of America the resources to do what we all want them to do: improve the education of children by involving parents, by ensuring that the parent as the first teacher does not surrender that critical role when that child enters school.

I will at the appropriate time ask for the yeas and nays when it is judged to be in order. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order at this time, if the Senator from Rhode Island wishes to make that request.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Chair repeat the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator was asking when it would be in order to request the yeas and nays. Does the Senator make that request?

Mr. REED. I make that request now pending the decision as to when a vote will be scheduled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Rhode Island, Senator REED, for his perseverance on

this issue over a long period of time. He has been an enormously active, involved, informed, committed member of our Education Committee. Not only does he have that commitment in the Senate, but he had it in the House of Representatives as well.

When he talks about what we did in 1994 with title I, he knows because he was in that conference. Those of us who served with him know his strong and sensible commitment on involving parents in the education of their children, as well as on the issues of libraries. There are many others, but those always spring up when I hear him talk about education policy.

He is absolutely correct about the importance of parental involvement. I am not going to take the time of the Senate this afternoon, but there is an excellent report of the Department of Education of several years ago that reaches the conclusion that there is significant academic improvement by involving the parents in the educational learning process of children. The studies at that time happened to be in the fifth grade and earlier.

It is fairly self-evident—as a father, as well, of a senior who will be graduating this Friday, and of a daughter who is in high school—every parent who does involve themselves in that opportunity can make an extraordinary difference in the children's understanding as well as their desire to learn. I certainly have seen that through personal experience, and I think most parents do.

The problem, as the Senator has pointed out, is that the teachers themselves do not receive training in the techniques of involving the parents in the classroom and classroom work. With very limited resources, that effort can produce significant and profound results.

That is what the Senator is advocating this afternoon: that we take a tried and tested concept, which is parental involvement, and give additional life to that concept in resources and build on what we did in the 1994 title I education legislation.

This builds on what we have attempted to do, and what we have attempted to do in this legislation is to understand better what is working across this country and to give these menus to local communities and permit local communities to make decisions based upon local needs, and then to hold them accountable in how these funds are going to be invested and have an evaluation of these programs so we know what is working in terms of our participation and our support of these initiatives.

This one makes a great deal of sense. It is about as intuitive as any amendment. Every parent who has a child in school understands the value of involvement. If more teachers reach out and involve the parents, this will add an additional dimension.

We will build particularly on a number of the existing programs, most obviously in literacy, helping children to read and give new value to books and help them work with children in a very productive way.

I thank the Senator. I am hopeful this amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I also acknowledge, as did Senator KENNEDY, Senator REED's intense interest and efforts to address the issue of parental involvement in the school system. His mark is on this bill as a result of that. Parents are mentioned literally hundreds of times in this bill, and there are initiatives to try to give local school districts more resources to assist in bringing parents into the effort of the schoolday. In fact, there is a 1 percent setaside in the title I funds money to carry forward parental involvement initiatives. This can add up to a lot of money. That is where my concern is.

Essentially, the Senator from Rhode Island has suggested we create what amounts to a new \$500 million program for parents and parental activity in the school systems. It is pretty liberal in its structure. It could be for coffees, in order to get parents involved; it could be for mailers involving parents or for parent peer groups. It is hard for people at the Federal level to be everything to everybody in education.

There are important needs in the area of education. But we need to remember that the Federal dollars in education are only 6 to 7 percent of the total dollars spent in local and elementary schools. To get the most value for those dollars, we must focus those dollars in specific areas. We have chosen to focus those dollars on special needs children. We have chosen to focus those dollars in this bill on children from low-income families, and specifically on trying to raise the academic standards of those children to make sure they are not left behind as they move through the school system.

There are a lot of other issues that involve schools. There are good language programs; there are good sports and computer science activities. Equally important—and I do not deny it—is the need to have parents involved with their children in the school system. However, we cannot be everything to everybody. If we create a new \$500 million program for that, we are taking away from the initiatives being directed at the areas where the Federal Government has chosen to set aside priorities, the special needs programs and the actual academic education of the low-income child. Because of the appropriation process, there will have to be a prioritization, and money will be moved from place to place. Inevitably, somebody wins and somebody loses.

This program, No. 1, although well intentioned, is far too expensive for the Federal Government to pursue; and, No. 2, it is inappropriate for the Federal Government to pursue. We have to look seriously at the cost of this bill as we continue to add any more of these well-intentioned programs on to the bill.

The bill presently, by my estimations, over the life of the authorization, is nearly \$400 million over where it started. That is a lot of money. This is another \$500 million on top of that. It may be an appropriate thought, but I do not think we need a new Federal program to accomplish this.

The issue of parental involvement is a local issue, probably the ultimate local issue. Shouldn't parents get involved in the schoolday? Absolutely. Should the Federal Government create the mechanisms to do that? No. That is the local responsibility of the parent and the parent structures within the local community and the local school systems which spend 93 percent of the education dollars in this country.

As well intentioned as this amendment is, I oppose it because I think it takes away from the main thrust of the bill. Therefore, it draws off potential resources we need to focus on, including the academic day and the special needs child. This is simply an addition of \$500 million on top of what has already become an extraordinarily expensive bill, moving beyond the availability of Members to support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from New Hampshire. He is exactly right. We have to be very careful about picking our shots with respect to Federal policy and recognize the predominance of the State and local community in education policy. Essentially, we have already made that decision. We made it years ago in the structure of title I. We passed laws requiring parent-school compacts, we required a whole host of parental involvement issues, because we recognized, as we do today, parental involvement is absolutely critical. It was not being performed, it was not being incorporated into the life of the schools, as it should be.

The question today is, Are we going to simply once again engage in a more general rhetorical exercise, or are we going to put up real resources? I guess we could go into these title I schools, the quarter of them that have not yet even completed, after 4 years, their parent-school compact, and perhaps order them to do it. Perhaps we could threaten to remove funds. That, to me, is not helping accomplish what we want to accomplish, which is making sure that these legislative requirements are, in fact, in place in the

schools of the United States. The answer is providing them the resources to do what they want to do and what we want them to do but, because of conflicting priorities, are not being done.

In affluent communities, that typically don't have many title I students, for a variety of reasons—one spouse is not working and is at home and able to participate; it is not difficult to communicate with schools because of the existence of the Internet; because the parents are college graduates—there are a host of reasons that we find there is parental involvement.

Our challenge is to go where it is harder to get the parental involvement: Parents may not have English as a first language or be college graduates; parents may not be a couple; rather, a single parent; parents might be forced to move periodically throughout the school year from school to school. It is a difficult challenge. We recognize that, and we have for years. We have said: Listen, schools, you have to develop these plans, these compacts. You have to reach out, you have to do better.

In this legislation, and the work of Senator KENNEDY, Senator JEFFORDS, and Senator GREGG, we have incorporated even more the recognition of parental involvement in our schools.

The question we face today, the classic question, is: Will we match our words with dollars? Will we match our requirements on schools to accept title I funds with real dollars to do what we want to do? I hope we answer that question in the affirmative.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, our Nation is less literate today than it was at the time of its founding. That might startle people, but that happens to be a fact. We are moving in the wrong direction with regard to literacy.

My State of Massachusetts is recognized, by most of the various economic evaluators and indicators, to be one of the top States from an education point of view, and a third of our workforce is at level one. A third of our workforce is at level one on literacy. That means they have difficulty reading a phone book. Those workers have children. Those children are going into title I schools, by and large. They may be above the minimum wage, but many are going into schools that are hard pressed.

We now have results. We find adult literacy works, but that is more complicated because these are parents who have to go to class after a long day's work, perhaps one or two jobs. This effort in bringing the family into the educational system has a proven, established record of positive results with regard to the parents and with regard to the children. All we are trying

to do is make sure, if we have something that we know works, we put that out before the local communities and let them make the judgment as to whether they want to participate in that program. That is what this amendment is all about.

Finally, it is true there has been a substantial increase in the cost of the legislation. It has been done in this way. To make sure the benefit of this legislation has accountability—it has an enhancement of teacher professional development and mentoring, it has an expansion in the literacy programs and accountability programs, the science and technology afterschool programs—we are going to make that available not just to a third of the children but to all the children. That has been done with the votes, particularly the bipartisan vote on Dodd-Collins and also the significant increase because of the bipartisan vote on Hagel-Harkin with regard to funding special needs.

Frankly, those were bipartisan efforts and I think they do reflect national priorities. We are moving along.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 412, AS MODIFIED; 416; 444, AS MODIFIED; 449, AS MODIFIED; 454, AS MODIFIED; 485, AS MODIFIED; 488; 507, AS MODIFIED; 603, AS MODIFIED; 645, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have amendments which have been cleared on both sides, and therefore I ask unanimous consent it be in order for these amendments to be considered en bloc and any modifications, where applicable, be agreed to, the amendments be agreed to en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask if the impact aid amendment is in this group.

Mr. KENNEDY. No, it is not included in this group.

Mr. INHOFE. However, there is a pretty clear understanding it will be included?

I understand it has been agreed to on both sides. I will not object.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will be glad to talk with the Senator in the next few minutes and give him an update on that issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. For the information of the Senate, these amendments are the Graham amendment No. 412, Domenici amendment No. 416, DeWine amendment No. 444, Cleland amendment No. 449, Gregg amendment No. 454, Bingaman amendment No. 485, Smith of New Hampshire amendment No. 488, Collins amendment No. 507, Sessions amendment No. 603, and Conrad amendment No. 645.

The amendments (Nos. 412, as modified; 416; 444, as modified; 449, as modified; 454, as modified; 485, as modified; 488; 507, as modified; 603, as modified; and 645, as modified) were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 412, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To identify factors that impact student achievement)

On page 53, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

“(8) FACTORS IMPACTING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.—Each State plan shall include a description of the process that will be used with respect to any school within the State that is identified for school improvement or corrective action under section 1116 to identify the academic and other factors that have significantly impacted student achievement at the school.

On page 71, line 24, strike “and”.
On page 72, line 3, strike the period and end quotation mark, and insert “and” after the semicolon.

On page 72, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

“(11) a description of the process that will be used with respect to any school identified for school improvement or corrective action that is served by the local educational agency to determine the academic and other factors that have significantly impacted student achievement at the school.”;

On page 104, line 7, strike “and”.
On page 104, line 13, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

On page 104, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

“(C) for each school in the State that is identified for school improvement or corrective action, notify the Secretary of academic and other factors that were determined by the State educational agency under section 1111(b)(8) as significantly impacting student achievement; and

“(D) if a school in the State is identified for school improvement or corrective action, encourage appropriate State and local agencies and community groups to develop a consensus plan to address any factors that significantly impacted student achievement.”.

On page 119, line 19, strike the end quotation mark and the second period.

On page 119, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

“(g) OTHER AGENCIES.—If a school is identified for school improvement, the Secretary may notify other relevant federal agencies regarding the academic and other factors determined by the SEA under §1111(b)(8) as significantly impacting student performance.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 416

(Purpose: To provide for teacher recruitment centers)

On page 319, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

“(12) Establishing and operating a center that—

“(A) serves as a statewide clearinghouse for the recruitment and placement of kindergarten, elementary school, and secondary school teachers; and

“(B) establishes and carries out programs to improve teacher recruitment and retention within the State.

AMENDMENT NO. 444, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To modify provisions relating to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994 with respect to therapists)

On page 568, line 19, insert “therapists,” before “nurses”.

AMENDMENT NO. 449, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To support the activities of education councils and professional development schools)

On page 319, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

“(12) Supporting the activities of education councils and professional development schools, involving partnerships described in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (c), respectively, for the purpose of—

“(A) preparing out-of-field teachers to be qualified to teach all of the classes that the teachers are assigned to teach;

“(B) preparing paraprofessionals to become fully qualified teachers in areas served by high need local educational agencies;

“(C) supporting teams of master teachers and student teacher interns as a part of an extended teacher education program; and

“(D) supporting teams of master teachers to serve in low-performing schools.

On page 329, line 7, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

On page 329, line 13, strike the period and insert “; and”.

On page 329, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

“(C) may include activities carried out jointly with education councils and professional development schools, involving partnerships described in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (c), respectively, for the purpose of improving teaching and learning at low-performing schools.

On page 329, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

“(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) EDUCATION COUNCIL.—The term ‘education council’ means a partnership that—

“(A) is established between—

“(i) 1 or more local educational agencies, acting on behalf of elementary schools or secondary schools served by the agencies; and

“(ii) 1 or more institutions of higher education, including community colleges, that meet the requirements applicable to the institutions under title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1021 et seq.); and

“(B) provides professional development to teachers to ensure that the teachers are prepared and meet high standards for teaching, particularly by educating and preparing prospective teachers in a classroom setting and enhancing the knowledge of in-service teachers while improving the education of the classroom students.

“(2) LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOL.—The term ‘low-performing school’ means an elementary school or secondary school that is identified for school improvement under section 1116(c).

“(3) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL.—The term ‘professional development school’ means a partnership that—

“(A) is established between—

“(i) 1 or more local educational agencies, acting on behalf of elementary schools or secondary schools served by the agencies; and

“(ii) 1 or more institutions of higher education, including community colleges, that meet the requirements applicable to the institutions under title II of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

“(B)(i) provides sustained and high quality preservice clinical experience, including the mentoring of prospective teachers by veteran teachers;

“(ii) substantially increases interaction between faculty at institutions of higher education described in subparagraph (A) and new and experienced teachers, principals,

and other administrators at elementary schools or secondary schools; and

“(iii) provides support, including preparation time, for such interaction.

AMENDMENT NO. 454 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To exempt certain small States from the annual NAEP testing requirements)

On page 53, line 22, insert before the semicolon the following: “, except that a State in which less than .25 percent of the total number of poor, school-aged children in the United States is located shall be required to comply with the requirement of this paragraph on a biennial basis”.

On page 778, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

“(c) SMALL STATES.—For the purpose of carrying out subsection (a)(2) and section 6201(a)(2)(A)(i)(II), with respect to any year for which a small State described in section 1111(c)(2) does not participate in the assessments described in section 1111(c)(2), the Secretary shall use the most recent data from those assessments for that State.

AMENDMENT NO. 485 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To establish a national technology initiatives program)

On page 379, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

“SEC. 2310. NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program to identify and disseminate the practices under which technology is effectively integrated into education to enhance teaching and learning and to improve student achievement, performance and technology literacy.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—In carrying out the program established under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

“(1) conduct, through the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, in consultation with the Office of Educational Technology, an independent, longitudinal study on—

“(A) the conditions and practices under which educational technology is effective in increasing student academic achievement; and

“(B) the conditions and practices that increase the ability of teachers to effectively integrate technology into the curricula and instruction, enhance the learning environment and opportunities, and increase student performance, technology literacy, and related 21st century skills; and

“(2) make widely available, including through dissemination on the Internet and to all State educational agencies and other grantees under this section, the findings identified through the activities of this section regarding the conditions and practices under which education technology is effective.

On page 379, line 20, strike the heading and insert the following:

“SEC. 2311. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

On page 380, line 4, strike the quote and the period.

On page 380, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

“(c) FUNDING FOR NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES.—Not more than .5 percent of the funds appropriated under subsection (a) may be used for the activities of the Secretary under section 2310.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 488

(Purpose: To provide for the conduct of a study concerning sexual abuse in schools)

On page 893, after line 14, add the following:

SEC. ____ STUDY AND RECOMMENDATION WITH RESPECT TO SEXUAL ABUSE IN SCHOOLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) sexual abuse in schools between a student and a member of the school staff or a student and another student is a cause for concern in the United States;

(2) relatively few studies have been conducted on sexual abuse in schools and the extent of this problem is unknown;

(3) according to the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act, a school administrator is required to report any allegation of sexual abuse to the appropriate authorities;

(4) an individual who is falsely accused of sexual misconduct with a student deserves appropriate legal and professional protections;

(5) it is estimated that many cases of sexual abuse in schools are not reported; and

(6) many of the accused staff quietly resign at their present school district and are then rehired at a new district which has no knowledge of their alleged abuse.

(b) STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Secretary of Education in conjunction with the Attorney General shall provide for the conduct of a comprehensive study of the prevalence of sexual abuse in schools. Not later than May 1, 2002, the Secretary and the Attorney General shall prepare and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and to State and local governments, a report concerning the study conducted under this subsection, including recommendations and legislative remedies for the problem of sexual abuse in schools.

AMENDMENT NO. 507 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide that funds for mathematics and science partnerships may be used to encourage girls and young women to pursue postsecondary degrees and careers in mathematics and science)

On page 350, between lines 4 and 5, insert the following:

“(9) Training teachers and developing programs to encourage girls and young women to pursue postsecondary degrees and careers in mathematics and science, including engineering and technology.

AMENDMENT NO. 603 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To allow for-profit entities, including corporations, to be eligible to receive Federal funds under title IV, either through grants or contracts with States or direct contracts or grants with the Federal Government)

On page 440, lines 15 and 16, strike “and other public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations” and insert “and public and private entities”

On page 440, line 22, strike “nonprofit organizations” and insert “entities”.

On page 460, lines 7 and 8, strike “and other public entities and private nonprofit organizations” and insert “and public and private entities”.

On page 483, lines 20 and 21, strike “non-profit organizations” and insert “entities”.

On page 489, lines 14 and 15, strike “non-profit private organizations” and insert “private entities”.

AMENDMENT NO. 645 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for professional development for teachers)

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. 203. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

Section 3141(b)(2)(A) (20 U.S.C. 6861(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (ii)(V), by adding “and” after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) the provision of incentives, including bonus payments, to recognized educators who achieve an information technology certification that is directly related to the curriculum or content area in which the teacher provides instruction;”.

AMENDMENT NO. 485, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about my amendment supporting National Technology Initiatives. I'd like to thank my colleagues for accepting this amendment. My amendment seeks to ensure that a program of research be conducted to identify and disseminate the practices under which technology is effectively integrated into education to enhance teaching and learning and to improve student achievement, performance and technology literacy.

During a period when technology has fundamentally transformed America's offices, factories and retail establishments, we have come to understand that if America is to maintain its place in the global economy, we must transform our Nation's classrooms by infusing technology across the curriculum. One common element that almost everyone agrees upon for improving the Nation's schools has been the more extensive and more effective utilization of educational technology. We have made progress. In large part, thanks to Federal funding under the e-rate program and the educational technology funds provided under a program that I sponsored during the 1994 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, student to computer ratios—even in the Nation's poorest schools—have improved and Internet access is no longer reserved just for schools in middle-class or wealthy communities. More and more classrooms are equipped with computers and other kinds of educational technologies. Teachers and students are beginning to make use of the enormous learning potential that educational technology provides. In many schools and classrooms the use of educational technology has contributed in substantial ways to student learning.

We know that the use of educational technology in our schools is related to favorable educational outcomes but we need to know more. In 1997, David Shaw, the Chairman of the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) outlined critical focus areas for educational technology research. Long term research designed to illuminate how technology might best be used to support the learning process was described. My amendment provides for such longitudinal research conducted through the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. In keeping with my ongoing interest in providing accountability for edu-

cational efforts, the research seeks to identify the conditions and practices under which educational technology is effective in increasing student achievement. Further, the research authorized under my amendment seeks to identify the conditions and practices that increase the ability to teachers to effectively integrate technology into the curriculum and instruction, enhance the learning environment and opportunities and increase student performance, technology literacy and related 21st century skills. Research of this nature is deemed critical to guiding our continued efforts to effectively infuse technology into our classroom activities. My amendment provides that the findings of this research be made widely available and sets aside a rather modest .5 percent of the federal technology funds for this purpose.

Recommendations from PCAST and other important stakeholder groups, including the Web-Based Commission and the CEO Forum, continue to emphasize the importance of conducting research about how educational technology works to enhance student learning. It seems likely that further experience with the use of educational technology in our schools will result in significant improvements over time in educational outcomes. However, such improvements are critically dependent on long-term rigorous research aimed at assessing the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of various approaches to the use of educational technology in actual classrooms. The questions that remain no longer relate to whether or not technology can be used effectively in schools. Rather the questions relate to how approaches to technology use in the classroom are in fact most effective and cost-effective in practice. I believe that this amendment will ensure that we will continue to find answers to these questions.

Thank-you.

Mr. KENNEDY. For the information of the Senate, we expect the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island sometime in the later afternoon. There will be a proposal on behalf of the leadership that will indicate the exact time, but it will be sometime around 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to make a couple of comments about the amendment to which I alluded with the Senator from Massachusetts just a moment ago. It has to do with impact aid. I think that is a very misunderstood issue.

Back in the 1950s when various Government programs and military installations and other land operations came in and took land off the tax rolls, that had a negative impact on our schools. I know in my State of Oklahoma we have five major military installations. While the amount of money that would

be generated from the taxes is taken off the tax rolls, we still have to educate the children. For that reason, back in the 1950s a program was set up to replenish the money that otherwise would have gone to schools.

This is something everyone supports. However, since the 1950s, there has been this insatiable appetite for politicians to take money out of the system, and they have done this, so impact aid has dropped down to about 25 percent of funding.

Starting 3 years ago, I had an amendment to incrementally build that up. Hopefully, 4 or 5 years from now, we will reach the point where it will be 100 percent funded. This is the right thing to do. It is not partisan, liberal or conservative. It is something that has to be done. We have an amendment, and, I say to the Senator from Massachusetts as well as the Senator from New Hampshire, I appreciate their cooperation and willingness to include this in the managers' amendment.

As I say, we have passed this now for 2 consecutive years. We are slowly getting up to where we can properly take care of school districts that have been unfavorably impacted by the reduction in the tax rolls. I thank them for that and for their assurance this will be in a managers' amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I understand the impact aid amendment, I am going to urge the support of that amendment. It will be included in the next group for consent. It is in the pipeline, and I have every expectation it will be so included and I thank the Senator for his cooperation on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am delighted to rise today to address another amendment, if the Senator from Massachusetts is ready for that?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. We are ready.

Mrs. CLINTON. I move to lay aside the pending amendment temporarily.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 517 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mrs. CLINTON. Earlier in this debate, I came to the floor with colleagues from both sides of the aisle to focus on what I believe is one of our greatest national crises; namely, the shortage of teachers in our highest need schools. By that I mean schools that do not have qualified teachers, whether they are in inner cities, in older suburbs, or in our rural areas. I was very pleased we passed a bipartisan amendment incorporating many of the ideas that I and others brought to the floor, to provide needed resources to recruit and retain teachers, that will help our children meet high academic standards.

Along with qualified teachers and up-to-date resources, all students need to attend schools where we have high-

quality principals who will work together with teachers and parents to create a learning environment that will maximize the achievements of every single child. But too many schools around our country open their doors every school year without principals in place or without the kind of high-quality principals every school should be able to have.

I really believe we would be remiss if we did not recognize that our schools are struggling to find principals, just as they are struggling to find qualified teachers. In fact, more than 40 percent of public school principals are expected to retire in the next 10 years. The problem is especially severe in our urban and rural areas, with 52 percent of rural districts reporting a shortage and 47 percent of urban districts.

In public schools in New York City, for example, 65 percent of our current principals are eligible to retire. In New York State overall, 50 percent of all principals are expected to retire in the next 5 years.

In any business, in any walk of life, if we thought we were going to lose half of our leaders, I think we would be quite concerned. I bring that concern to the floor because we simply cannot afford to lose the people who are supposed to be providing instructional leadership and direction to our teachers. That is why earlier this year I introduced the National Teacher and Principal Recruitment Act.

Today I am offering an amendment that reflects part of my bill focused on recruiting principals. It authorizes the Secretary of Education to offer grants to recruit and retain principals in high-need school districts through such activities as mentoring new principals, providing financial incentives or bonuses to recruit principals, and providing career mentorship and professional development activities.

I believe if we are serious about educational reform, we have to be serious about recruiting and retaining qualified principals. If we are going to have a system that holds our students and our teachers accountable, we have to have somebody who is responsible for implementing those accountability measures. That, to me, leads us to call for the CEOs, if you will, of our schools. Those are our principals.

We need school leaders to guide our teachers and help our students to achieve high academic standards.

A 1999 report issued by the National Association of State Boards of Education characterized effective principals as "the linchpins of school improvement" and "the gatekeepers of change."

We know a similar study conducted by the Arthur Andersen consulting firm, of high- and low-performing schools in Jersey City and Patterson, NJ, found that the one attribute of all the high-performing schools we visited is a dedicated and dynamic principal.

I have been going in and out of schools, I guess, ever since I was in one myself but, as an adult, for nearly 20 years. And I know from my own observation and experience that the principal is the key. We can have great teachers, but if they are in a system or in a school that doesn't value their contributions and that doesn't work with them to do the very best they can, we are not going to get the results that we need.

In 1999, New York City schools opened their doors with 165 uncertified principals. In Buffalo last year, the school district faced 10 principal vacancies and only received 11 applications.

So they basically will put a warm body in wherever they can find one. And that is not a problem that is unique to New York. In Vermont, one out of five principals had retired or resigned by the end of the last school year. In Washington State, 15 percent of principals retired or resigned. And in Baltimore, 34 of 180 principals left in the last 2 years alone.

I absolutely would agree that an amendment is not going to turn this problem around, but we have to recognize the problem, be willing to admit its extraordinary depth around our country, and then try to put into place at the local, State, and Federal level efforts to try to fill the need.

We need efforts such as the one that is currently going on in New York City where the chancellor is providing additional training and support to principals who are new to the profession to help them believe they can make that kind of commitment to difficult schools that really need their leadership. The nonprofit New Leaders for New Schools Project is also trying to attract talented teachers into the ranks of our principals.

This amendment is a small step to support local and State efforts to recruit and retain the next generation of school leaders. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of our principals and in favor of recruiting and retaining them.

In New York, Norman Wechsler, a former principal of Dewitt Clinton High School in the Bronx, illustrates the importance of this problem. He helped to lead that school from failure to success by raising the standards and holding students and teachers accountable for results.

It is very important that we recruit and keep such principals in our public schools or else the work we are doing so diligently, attempting to forge the kind of consensus we need to pass this education bill, will not have the results it should have.

This bill holds a lot of promise. It puts the Federal Government squarely on the side of accountability. It sets forth measurements that we will use to make decisions about schools. Yet if we don't have our teachers and principals in place to do this work, then it is just

going to be another piece of legislation. It won't have the effect that we all want it to have.

I hope we will agree to this amendment that it is aimed at helping us address the Nation's principal shortage.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield for a question.

Mrs. CLINTON. Yes.

Mr. GREGG. Does the Senator wish to go to a vote at this time?

Mrs. CLINTON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I don't believe the amendment is pending just yet.

Mrs. CLINTON. I call up amendment No. 517.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mrs. CLINTON] proposes an amendment numbered 517.

Mrs. CLINTON. 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 a national principal recruitment program)

On page 309, lines 17 and 18, strike "subsection (f)" and insert "subsections (b) and (f)".

On page 339, line 6, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

On page 339, strike lines 7 through 16 and insert the following:

"(b) SCHOOL LEADERSHIP.—

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—

"(A) HIGH-NEED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term 'high-need local educational agency' means a local educational agency for which more than 30 percent of the students served by the local educational agency are students in poverty.

"(B) POVERTY LINE.—The term 'poverty line' means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

"(C) STUDENT IN POVERTY.—The term 'student in poverty' means a student from a family with an income below the poverty line.

"(2) PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a national principal recruitment program.

"(3) GRANTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall make grants, on a competitive basis, to high-need local educational agencies that seek to recruit and train principals (including assistant principals).

"(B) USE OF FUNDS.—An agency that receives a grant under subparagraph (A) may use the funds made available through the grant to carry out principal recruitment and training activities that may include—

"(i) providing stipends for master principals who mentor new principals;

"(ii) using funds innovatively to recruit new principals, including recruiting the principals by providing pay incentives or bonuses;

"(iii) developing career mentorship and professional development ladders for teachers who want to become principals; and

"(iv) developing incentives, and professional development and instructional leadership training programs, to attract individuals from other fields, including business and law, to serve as principals.

"(C) APPLICATION AND PLAN.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, a local educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall include—

"(i) a needs assessment concerning the shortage of qualified principals in the school district involved and an assessment of the potential for recruiting and retaining prospective and aspiring leaders, including teachers who are interested in becoming principals; and

"(ii) a comprehensive plan for recruitment and training of principals, including plans for mentorship programs, ongoing professional development, and instructional leadership training, for high-need schools served by the agency.

"(D) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall give priority to local educational agencies that demonstrate that the agencies will carry out the activities described in subparagraph (B) in partnership with nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education.

"(E) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds appropriated to carry out this subsection shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds expended to provide principal recruitment and retention activities.

"(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and each subsequent fiscal year.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I call for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 517) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. GREGG. 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, we just completed the acceptance of approximately 10 or 12 amendments. We had a series of amendments that were accepted last evening, and we will have additional ones later in the afternoon.

At the request of the leaders, we have put off the votes hopefully until 4:30 this afternoon where we will have several votes on matters which have been debated. It is not the way I would like to proceed nor, I am sure, the way my friend and colleague from New Hamp-

shire would wish to proceed. However, there are other considerations.

We have been able to move a number of these. We have disposed of a number of amendments. We have had some amendments which have been withdrawn, and we are going to talk to other colleagues. I have, through the staff, talked to each Member two or three times on their amendments. We are under a lot of pressure to reach a time definite for final passage of this legislation. We have tried to respect the fact that our colleagues have offered these amendments—they are important to them—and to accommodate their interests.

Quite frankly, we are reaching the point where I will join with those—I know this has been the position of my friend from New Hampshire—who believe that we ought to set a time definite and then go into a vote-athon, if people want to vote in that way, every 2 minutes. The Senate will have to work its will.

What is completely unacceptable is for Members, who have been on notice prior to the time we went on the Memorial Day recess, to now, in the mid-afternoon, believe they are not quite ready to deal with these. We want to put everyone on notice that we are getting to the point where we are going to urge that we have a time definite for final passage. There will be objection. They will come to the Chamber and object, and then they will go off. And when they are off, we will make the motion again. So they are going to have to come. That is the way it used to be done.

We want to accommodate our colleagues, but we want to be clear that this is serious business. If Members have amendments and they are serious about them, which I believe they are, they ought to be serious enough to come and offer and debate them. We are running into the situation where too many of our colleagues have been unwilling to do so.

Everyone understands there are a lot of different activities going on, particularly today. But there are always a lot of different activities every single day.

This is about education. It is about our children. It is about their future.

Senator REID will go back and call those who have the amendments. We should not have to do it. We should be hearing from our colleagues about the time. We will do the best we can to arrange it. But we are getting into the position now, after this week, where we are going to move towards reaching a time definite for final consideration. Then we will have an opportunity to dispose of these amendments.

I would like to support a number of them. A number of them would be helpful to the bill. But if we get into that kind of situation, it doesn't serve the cause, the amendments, or those who are offering the amendments well.

We will put in, starting tomorrow at least, the amendments that remain and the authors of those amendments and try, by publishing those amendments, to indicate which ones are remaining so that the American people know what the amendment is and who is offering it. Hopefully, we will be able to move this process forward. We have every intention of doing so.

It is a disservice to the children and to the parents in the country that we don't meet our responsibilities in this very important legislation.

I know my colleague, the Senator from Connecticut, will be here in a few moments. The good Senator from Wisconsin has a matter of great importance to bring to the Senate's attention.

I yield the floor at this time. Hopefully, we will have enough time to dispose of the Dodd amendment.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized as in morning business in order to introduce a bill.

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

(The remarks of Mr. FEINGOLD and Mr. CORZINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 989 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. KENNEDY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 459 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 459 for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], for himself and Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. REED, proposes an amendment numbered 459.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for the comparability of educational services available to elementary and secondary students within States)

On page 134, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(5) by striking subsection (d) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(d) COMPARABILITY OF SERVICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) A State that receives funds under this part shall provide services in schools receiving funds under this part that, taken as a whole, are at least comparable to services in schools that are not receiving funds under this part.

“(B) A State shall meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) on a school-by-school basis.

“(2) WRITTEN ASSURANCE.—(A) A State shall be considered to have met the requirements of paragraph (1) if such State has filed with the Secretary a written assurance that such State has established and implemented policies to ensure comparability among schools in—

“(i) class size and qualifications of teachers (by category of assignment, such as regular education, special education, and bilingual education) and professional staff;

“(ii) curriculum, the range of courses offered (including the opportunity to participate in rigorous courses such as advanced placement courses), and instructional materials and instructional resources to ensure that participating children have the opportunity to achieve to the highest student performance levels under the State's challenging content and student performance standards;

“(iii) accessibility to technology; and

“(iv) the safety of school facilities.

“(B) A State need not include unpredictable changes in student enrollment or personnel assignments that occur after the beginning of a school year in determining comparability of services under this subsection.

“(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a jurisdiction to increase its property tax or other tax rates.

“(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A State shall comply with the requirements of this subsection by not later than the beginning of the 2003-2004 school year.

“(5) SANCTIONS.—If a State fails to comply with the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary shall withhold funds for State administration until such time as the Secretary determines that the State is in compliance with this subsection.”

Mr. DODD. I ask unanimous consent to send a modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREGG. Reserving the right to object, have we seen the modification?

Mr. DODD. It is technical. I apologize; you have not seen it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 459, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask for consideration of the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

The amendment (No. 459), as modified, is as follows:

On page 134, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(5) by striking subsection (d) (as so redesignated) and inserting the following:

“(d) COMPARABILITY OF SERVICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) A State that receives funds under this part shall provide services in schools receiving funds under this part

that, taken as a whole, are at least comparable to services in schools that are not receiving funds under this part.

“(B) A State shall meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) on a school-by-school basis.

“(2) WRITTEN ASSURANCE.—(A) A State shall be considered to have met the requirements of paragraph (1) if such State has filed with the Secretary a written assurance that such State has established and implemented policies to ensure comparability among schools in—

“(i) class size and qualifications of teachers (by category of assignment, such as regular education, special education, and bilingual education) and professional staff, through programs such as incentives for voluntary transfer and recruitment;

“(ii) curriculum, the range of courses offered (including the opportunity to participate in rigorous courses such as advanced placement courses), and instructional materials and instructional resources to ensure that participating children have the opportunity to achieve to the highest student performance levels under the State's challenging content and student performance standards;

“(iii) accessibility to technology; and

“(iv) the safety of school facilities.

“(B) A State need not include unpredictable changes in student enrollment or personnel assignments that occur after the beginning of a school year in determining comparability of services under this subsection.

“(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require a jurisdiction to increase its property tax or other tax rates.

“(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A State shall comply with the requirements of this subsection by not later than the beginning of the 2005-2006 school year.

“(5) WAIVERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State may request, and the Secretary may grant, a waiver of the requirements of this subsection for a period of up to 2 years for exceptional circumstances, such as a precipitous decrease in State revenues or other circumstances that the Secretary deems exceptional that prevent a State from complying with the requirements of this paragraph.

“(B) CONTENTS OF WAIVER REQUEST.—A State that requests a waiver under subparagraph (A) shall include in the request—

“(i) a description of the exceptional circumstances that prevent the State from complying with the requirements of this subsection; and

“(ii) a plan that details the manner in which the State will comply with such requirements by the end of the waiver period.

“(6) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall, upon the request of a State and regardless of whether the State has requested a waiver under paragraph (5), provide technical assistance with the requirements of this subsection.

“(7) SANCTIONS.—If a State fails to comply with the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary shall withhold funds for State administration until such time as the Secretary determines that the State is in compliance with this subsection.”

Mr. DODD. The modification extends the time under which the provisions of this amendment ask the States to provide an additional 2 years for a waiver period.

I ask unanimous consent our colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED, be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague from Delaware, Senator BIDEN, for joining in this effort. I thank our colleague in the other body, a Member by the name of CHAKA FATTAH, of the city of Philadelphia, for being the source and inspiration of this amendment. He is behind this amendment, and he has very eloquently made the case.

This amendment has value and importance. I begin my brief comments by thanking the distinguished member from the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania for his contribution in what I think is a worthwhile idea.

I expect this to provoke debate and even significant opposition. It may not pass, but at some point this issue must be addressed if we are ever going to effectively deal with some of the incredible inequities that exist across this great land of ours in servicing the 50 million children who enter our public schools as elementary or secondary school students.

I thank Senator BIDEN, Senator REED, and Congressman CHAKA FATTAH. The amendment encourages States to ensure that all students receive a comparable education as measured by class size, teacher quality, curricula, technology, and school safety. I note, of course, that the Presiding Officer is a former Governor. He will add particular value to this discussion and debate as someone who has had to grapple with these very issues.

The amendment allows States 4 years to comply and allows for a waiver of up to 2 years for extraordinary circumstances, such as the precipitous decline in State revenues or other circumstances that the Secretary of Education determines are exceptional that prevent a State from providing comparable education services to all students.

Equal opportunity, as we all know, is a very fundamental right in our society. It is why people from around the globe have dreamed of coming to this land, why thousands every day circle U.S. embassies all over the world seeking visas to come to the United States, seeking permanent status as residents. For over 200 years, the notion of equal opportunity has been a hallmark of our society. We don't guarantee success; we guarantee everyone an equal opportunity to achieving success. This amendment goes to the very heart of that discussion and that debate.

In 1965, we created the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—that was more than 35 years ago—to make equal opportunity the centerpiece of our educational laws. It is making a difference. A 1999 study found students receiving title I funds increased their

reading achievement in 21 of 24 urban districts in America and increased their math achievement in 20 of 24 urban districts. I quickly add, while this is an improvement, it is not yet success. Clearly, we are heading in the right direction. Our common hope is that this bill, once adopted, adds to that success.

A study published earlier this year concluded:

Whenever an inner city or poor rural school is found to be achieving outstanding results with its students by implementing innovative strategies, those innovations are almost invariably funded primarily by title I.

Title I is not making enough of a difference because we are still not providing school districts with sufficient resources, in my mind and in the mind of a majority of our colleagues, to close this achievement gap. During the debate, the Senate overwhelmingly adopted, by a vote of 79-21, an amendment I offered, along with my colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS, to establish the goal of fully funding title I within the next 10 years. This education bill will require States to set a goal of having children be proficient in reading and math in 10 years. The least the Congress can do is to set a goal of providing school districts with the resources that will help children achieve those goals. That is the reason behind the amendment adopted so overwhelmingly just a few weeks ago.

Title I means more teachers, more professional development, more computers, textbooks, more individualized instruction, more preschool and after-school programs and other reforms that will be necessary, if, in fact, these students are going to continue to improve and achieve the accountability standards.

As the vote on the Dodd-Collins amendment demonstrated, even a strong majority of both parties support devoting more resources to education, particularly to the neediest students in our country, so those resources can be included in a budget resolution which could be stripped out by those who seek to reduce the support for title I.

No one questions the need to hold schools accountable for student achievement. Accountability without resources is an empty shell. This is a problem with virtually every State in the Nation.

According to the Department of Education, when comparing all districts in this country, high-minority districts receive less than other districts on a combined cost and need-adjusted basis. This means high-minority districts which may often have greater concentrations of high-need students, have less buying power, thus fewer resources to meet the needs of students in their schools.

Since high-minority districts in most States are operating with less total

revenue than low-minority districts, these districts have less revenue to provide the educational programs and services their students need to achieve the high standards and prepare to enter higher education or the workforce.

In 42 of 49 States recently studied by the Education Trust, school districts with the greatest number of poor children had fewer resources per student than districts with fewer poor children. During the 1980s and 1990s, 43 States faced legal challenges to their school financing systems, calling for equity of resources and services. Many State courts held their systems violated State constitutions.

I do not intend to suggest by my remarks here for this amendment that States should unnecessarily become the targets of some opposition. That is a difficult problem that States are facing. My State is a classic example of one that has wrestled with this disparity of educational opportunity. These problems have deep roots, they go back a long way, and they affect States all across the country.

But we are going to say in this bill that in school districts, if there are schools there that are not performing and there is a series of steps and criteria they must meet, then we the Federal Government are saying to those districts: You are going to have to shut them down.

We have also even suggested at the national level that we might get rid of the Department of Education.

We are saying to local communities, do the following things or you pay a price. We even suggest at the national level, if we do not do certain things, something else may happen here. The one political equation that is sort of left out of all of this is at the State level. That is the one political entity that has an awful lot to do with determining what happens in terms of equality of opportunity within our respective 50 States. That is what this amendment is designed to do.

It says in this bill: Communities, you have to do a better job. It says the Federal Government has to do a better job.

What my amendment says is the third party to all this, the States, they also have to do a better job in seeing to it that there is equality of opportunity.

Let me cite, if I can, the example of my home State, Connecticut. In the 1980s, Connecticut, with an increasingly low-income, minority, and limited-English population, has pursued a constant strategy to try to ensure all its students are taught by high-quality teachers.

Just to put this in perspective, Connecticut is a relatively small State. It is about the size of Yellowstone National Park, if you want to use that as a comparative model. Yet within that same State, I have some of the most affluent Americans in the country. In fact, my State is often identified as the

most affluent State on a per capita basis. I would quickly add that the city of Hartford, our capital, is the eighth poorest city, and Bridgeport and New Haven and Waterbury are not very far behind. In the midst of this very small piece of territory, I have great affluence and I have significant poverty.

My State is willing to try to provide some sharing of resources, if you will. As we know, in most of our States, education is funded primarily by local property taxes. So a child growing up in one of my more affluent communities—obviously there are more resources there to provide the full educational opportunity. In my poorer communities, that has not been the case. States wrestle with this. But I think it is not too much for us at the Federal level, since we are demanding so much of school districts, to also ask this of our States. We know it is not easy. We know it is going to be very hard for school districts to live up to this and meet all the obligations we are going to be demanding in this bill. But people like CHAKA FATTAH and JOE BIDEN and JACK REED of Rhode Island and myself believe it is also not too much to say to our States: We want you to do a better job at this as well because so much of the resources and determination are going to come from States.

Remember, the Federal Government contributes about 6 cents out of every educational dollar. Mr. President, 94 cents for the education of elementary and secondary school students comes from the States and localities, the bulk of it coming from localities in most jurisdictions. So we are saying to our States, as we are saying to our communities, we want you to do a bit better.

Today I point out my State, Connecticut, regularly receives top rankings in assessments of reading, math, science, and writing. Connecticut has also increased its targeting of resources to low-income school districts. The State provides 27 times more resources per student to the lowest income districts compared to the highest income districts.

Nevertheless, by and large we enter the 21st century with a 19th century system of providing resources for our educational system. In large part, we still do this, as I mentioned a moment ago, with local property taxes. That may have made sense in the 19th century, even in a good part of the 20th century when children in Hartford competed with children in New Haven, or maybe with children in New York—occasionally some child in Pennsylvania. That was true in the 19th century.

In the 20th century, of course, children growing up in my State or anyplace else across the country are not just competing with each other or neighboring States. They will be competing with children in Beijing, in Mos-

cow, in Paris, in Sydney, Australia. It is a global economy and we have to have an educational system in this country that prepares all children to compete effectively in that kind of marketplace.

It is no longer enough in the 21st century to say we are going to leave this up to whatever the resource allocation may be in some rural county in the West, or some urban district in the East or Far West. We at the Federal level, I think, have to do more if we are going to be demanding greater accountability of students and school districts in rural and urban settings—then it should not be too much to ask it as well of our States. It made less sense, of course, as the 20th century progressed in this era of competition, but certainly it makes no sense as we enter the 21st century and children from Hartford, Chicago, and Los Angeles compete with children all over the globe.

The children today will be the first generation born, raised, and educated in truly a global economy. This amendment recognizes that by asking States, along with the Federal and local government, to share the responsibility—share it, so ensuring children's access to quality education is not dependent on how much money their parents make or their race or whether they live in a city or a suburb or rural area. Unfortunately, because of our current system, that is the case de facto. That is the case. Children growing up just a few short miles from each other have entirely different educational opportunities based on the total coincidence of their birth. In one locality that is poor, and one that is affluent, opportunity is not equal. It is not equal.

If we are going to truly talk about an Elementary and Secondary Education Act from a Federal perspective, a national perspective, then it seems to me we have to recognize that fact. There is not equal opportunity of education in America. So, if we do not begin to demand that more steps are taken to achieve that equal opportunity of education, then these resources, as we send them around the country without regard to what the States may be doing, ends up, I think, producing little improvement in the results we have seen over the last few years.

Schools with the highest concentrations of minority students have more than twice as many inexperienced teachers as schools with the lowest concentration of minority students. Schools with high concentrations of minority students are four times as likely as schools with low concentrations of minority students to hire teachers not licensed to teach in their main teaching field. Urban and rural schools, poor schools, are twice as likely to hire unlicensed teachers, or teachers who had only emergency or temporary licenses.

Of course, subject matter knowledge and experience make for better teachers and higher student achievement. We all know that. Yet according to a recent report, there is pervasive, almost chilling difference in the quality of teachers in schools serving poor, urban, and rural students than those serving children in the more affluent communities in our country. Urban districts and poor rural districts suffer in the quality of curriculum. For example, they are significantly less likely than suburban districts to have gifted and talented programs to provide challenges beyond the regular curriculum. According to the Department of Education, white students are significantly more likely than African-American students or Hispanic students to use a computer in a school.

According to Education Week, students in the highest poverty schools are barely half as likely to have Internet access in their classrooms as students in the lowest poverty schools. Internet access is also a problem in rural areas, where it is expensive for companies to lay cables necessary for access. The director of technology for one rural district said: Not only is there a digital divide, but we live in it in rural America.

These disparities affect not only these children's educational achievement but their ability to find a job in an increasingly technological workplace when they finish school. Not surprisingly, these inequities also persist in the quality of school buildings that serve different children.

Schools with higher concentrations of minority students generally are in worse condition than those with lower concentrations of minority students.

Schools with more than 50 percent minority enrollment are twice as likely as schools with 5 percent minorities to be in temporary buildings or to be in inadequate condition.

Research has shown a direct relationship between the quality of the school's facilities and student achievement. Again, this goes to the accident of a child's birthplace: Two children, usually in the same State, with very different opportunities for achievement.

What we are asking in this amendment is for school districts to do better. We are asking ourselves to do better. Is it really some outrageous leap for the Federal Government to be asking the States to do better as well in seeing to it that there is a better allocation of resources to provide a greater equal opportunity for education?

We can't simply impose accountability, as I said earlier, on a system that allows one school to have lower class sizes, better teachers, more technology, and better materials and another school that has none of those things and expect that equal opportunity to exist.

President Bush and Secretary Paige have often said that every child has the

ability to learn. I could not agree more. Every child has the ability to learn. Without question, the achievement gap is not the result of our children's failings. It is not their fault, not as they start out in school. It is not because poor kids or minority kids or urban kids or rural kids are any less smart or any less ambitious or any less determined to do well than their counterparts in more affluent districts.

No. It is largely because we have not supplied the same support to these poor children, and urban and rural children, and minority children in school districts around this country. It is the result of our failure to spend more than one penny of every Federal dollar for K-12 education. One penny of every Federal dollar—less than that—goes for the education of our children in this country. It is also the result of an outdated system of allocating resources at the State and local level.

This bill is about responsibility. We have heard that word used often during the debate on this legislation over the last number of weeks—about everyone who is involved in our children's education taking greater responsibility for their education. We are asking more from students, parents, teachers, schools, school districts, and the Federal Government. There is one word missing from that list. I have mentioned everyone responsible but one: States.

I know that my colleagues, from time to time, are reluctant to go back and talk about what Governors need to do. We are lectured all the time by Governors about what we can do at the Federal level. We are not afraid of talking about local mayors or school superintendents or PTA groups or school boards. Why should we be reluctant to talk to our Governors? They are not shy about asking us to do a better job. Is it too much to ask them to do a better job?

If we are going to withhold funds, as this bill does, from local school districts that do not perform better, is it too much to say to States, "If you do not perform better, then we are going to withhold administrative costs"? We are not going to deny children title I funds, but let the States pick up the tab on the administrative costs. That is what this amendment says.

We give them about 6 years to achieve that. I am not pushing it. And there are cases pending all across the country. I know States are trying hard in many cases, but I also know school districts are trying hard. This is not about whether or not you are trying hard. We are saying to people: Try harder, because our kids deserve better than they are getting today.

So as we lecture school superintendents and school boards and parents and kids—and everybody else—I do not think it is going too far to say to the States: We want you to do better. That is what this amendment does.

In the 1960s, Dr. Martin Luther King asked: How long will it take? How long for an end to segregation? How long for an end to inequality under the law?

I ask today: How long will it take for us to refuse to tolerate an educational system in which educational opportunity—which is the foundation of all opportunity—is determined by a child's family income, or race, or accident of birth in a piece of geography that does not have the resources to support the tools a child needs to achieve his or her maximum potential?

The States need to do a better job. This Federal Government—this body—ought not to shy away from asking the States to meet that responsibility, just as we have asked children. If we can ask an 8-year-old child to do a better job, we can ask a Governor to do a better job as well. Those who are doing it need not fear this amendment. But those States that are not doing anything about it need to know there is a price they will pay if they neglect this issue.

I am not going to penalize a local mayor who is trying hard despite a Governor in a State who refuses to bear their share of the burden.

That is what the amendment does. That is what CHAKA FATTAH has talked about. That is what others have suggested over the years that we ought to say today. If we are going to be tough on kids, and tough on parents, and tough on school districts, and tough on mayors, and tough on the Secretary of Education, then let's also be a little tough on our States.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I am a great admirer of the Senator from Connecticut. I enjoy working with him and always appreciate his creativity.

Mr. REID. Could I ask the manager of the bill to withhold briefly?

Mr. GREGG. Surely.

Mr. REID. Just so everyone knows—I have spoken to the manager of the bill, and Senator KENNEDY is aware of this—we are going to try to prepare a unanimous consent agreement immediately so we can have a vote at or about 4:30 on the Voinovich and Bingaman amendments.

Mr. GREGG. We might also vote on the Reed amendment at the same time.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, there is no UC request pending, but I will ask a question. I would like to speak to this amendment for about 8 to 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. We will make it 4:45.

Mr. BIDEN. Whatever.

Mr. DODD. Senator CORZINE wants to be heard.

Mr. REID. We will make it 5 o'clock. We will try do all three amendments.

Mr. DODD. Then you can do all three.

Mr. GREGG. All right. We are not doing this amendment; just the Reed

amendment and the Voinovich amendment and the Bingaman amendment.

Mr. DODD. We could do this one, too, and we would be done with it.

Mr. GREGG. I do not believe we can.

Mr. DODD. All right.

Mr. REID. I appreciate the Senator yielding.

Mr. GREGG. This amendment which is brought forward by the Senator from Connecticut, although benign in its phraseology, is pervasive in its effect. In fact, I am not sure there is another amendment that is pending before this bill—although the Senator from Connecticut has one which is pretty pervasive in its effect—but I am not sure there is another one that would have a larger impact, a more substantive impact, a more dramatic impact on the educational system of our country than this amendment right here.

The unintended consequences of it are, I am sure, overwhelming. I am not going to even try to anticipate them. I just read the amendment a little while ago, so I am not totally up to speed on the unintended consequences. I can tell you what the obvious intended consequences are of what amounts to essentially a nationalization of the educational systems of this country.

Education has always been a local and State responsibility. But when the Federal Government takes the role of saying that the local and State governments shall have comparable educational systems, and will become the enforcer of those comparable educational systems across the Nation, it is no longer the function of the local and State governments, it is the function of the Federal Government. The Federal Government has taken that power.

Comparability, as it is defined in this bill, would mean that every community in every State in the country would have to comply equally and be the same as every other community on all sorts of issues. I cannot even anticipate all the issues—but all sorts of issues: The number of kids in the classroom would have to be exactly the same or comparable, the number of teachers would have to be exactly the same or comparable, the types of teachers would have to be exactly the same or comparable, the computer equipment in the school would have to be exactly the same or comparable, the size of the classroom would have to be exactly the same or comparable, the size of the library would have to be exactly the same or comparable, size of the parking lot, size of the playing fields, schoolday, use of the schoolday, courses offered, whether Latin is offered, whether English is offered in advanced cases, whether advanced calculus is offered, whether Spanish is offered, whether Japanese is offered, free time within the schoolday, whether students had clubs that were the same, whether all the schools had a climbing

club, whether all the schools had a social outreach club, whether all the schools had an African-American society, whether all the schools had a historical society.

Comparability under this language means that essentially the Federal Government would suddenly become the arbiter of how every school in this country would operate in every piece of detail within that school system. This is the single most pervasive amendment I have ever seen at the Federal level in the area of education.

Some might argue the President's suggestion that every student in America should be tested is a pretty pervasive step. What the President said was that those tests would be decided at the local level. They would be designed by the State. Each State could have its own testing system, its own regime, and set its own standards. That is still pretty pervasive, I have to admit. But this goes a radical step beyond that. This essentially says that the Secretary of Education shall be informed by the States that every school in every system in every part of that State has a comparable capability in every function.

The impact of this is just really quite staggering. I have to wonder, for example, what it means to organized labor agreements. What happens if a labor union in one community in the State has negotiated for a different workweek for its teachers than the labor union in another part of the State or for a different ratio for its teachers or for a different certification of capability for its teachers. Are all those labor agreements suddenly out the window? It appears that way. It appears that either they are out the window, or the Federal support coming into the State is out the window because they aren't comparable and there is clearly not a comparable event there. It is pretty hard to make them comparable unless you are going to supersede collective bargaining as a concept in our society.

It is one thing for us, with 6 percent of the Federal budget of education at the local and State level, to expect them to deal effectively with low-income kids by requiring that those low-income kids not be left behind, which is what we have done in this bill as it is structured today, and to set up an output system where essentially we say we are going to leave it to you, the local school systems, to decide how you educate your children, but we are going to expect that low-income kids especially achieve and that they achieve at a level that is comparable with their peers and, if they happen to adopt the Straight A's Program under this, they actually achieve at a level that is better than their peers.

It is entirely something else for us to say because we are putting 6 percent of the funds in here, we are suddenly

going to require that every community in every State be comparable. And if they are not comparable, they will not get the Federal support. That is a huge step towards the nationalization of our educational system. It is pretty specifically outlined in the amendment.

We need to read this because it is so overwhelming. Let's begin here:

IN GENERAL.—A State that receives funds under this part shall provide services in schools receiving funds under this part that, taken as a whole, are at least comparable to services in schools that are not receiving funds under this part.

A State shall meet the requirements of subparagraph (A) on a school-by-school basis.

That means every school, every school in the State must be the same as every other school in the State as defined by the schools that are not title I schools.

A State shall be considered to have met the requirements of paragraph (1) if such State has filed with the Secretary a written assurance that the State has established and implemented policies to ensure comparability among schools in—

(i) class size and qualifications of teachers (by category of assignment, such as regular education, special education, and bilingual education) and professional staff, through programs such as incentives for voluntary transfer and recruitment;

(ii) curriculum, the range of courses offered. . .

How expansive is this? This is just the most incredibly expansive intrusion into the actual operation of the local school system that you could possibly conceive of. We are demanding at the Federal level, because we decided to put 6 percent of the money into the local school system, that every local school shall have a comparable curriculum, a comparable staffing structure, a comparable qualification structure for its teachers. There are a lot of schools in this country that don't need comparable situations that deliver pretty good education and are not the same as their neighbor. And, in fact, that is what choice is all about, public charter schools. You create a charter school because you don't think that the school down the street, which is doing the public school work—and they are both public schools, by the way; I am not talking private schools here—but you create a public charter school because you think the public school down the street is not doing such a good job.

Under this amendment, I honestly think we can't have a charter school program anymore. Charter schools is probably the most creative and imaginative activity that is occurring in the public school system today. Across this country, parents and teachers are getting together to start charter schools because they see them as an opportunity to break out from the strait-jacket of specific requirements that they get from their State school districts as to how to run their schools

and create schools that teach, which is the option and the obligation, of course, of the school systems, and to teach well.

Across this Nation, you can go to city after city, especially urban areas, where the charter school is the one that is delivering the quality education to kids who before were getting very little in the way of education. I honestly think under this amendment, charter schools would essentially be wiped out. Either that or everybody has to be a charter school, but you can't have everybody being a charter school because charter schools by definition are different. That is the whole concept behind charter schools.

Then there is something called a magnet school. It was started in North Carolina. The magnet education school is in the area of math/science. It was such a huge success that a lot of States have used it.

Mr. DODD. Will my colleague yield on this point for a little discussion?

Mr. GREGG. I will yield when I finish. I will be happy to discuss this further.

Magnet schools is the concept where you take a school that is a high-quality school and you draw kids into it who have special interests—math, science. Bedford-Stuyvestant in New York is a magnet school. There is one in Virginia in Arlington called Thomas Jefferson. And then, of course, there is the one in North Carolina that started the whole system.

I am wondering if under this amendment you can have magnet schools anymore, especially a magnet school that was a low-income, funded school because it would not be comparable. It would be too good. If you had a magnet school like they have in Houston, where it is, I think, 85 percent low-income kids, but it is excelling at an extraordinary level, that might not be able to function under this bill, or maybe it could, but the State would not meet the comparability standards here.

Comparability may sound like a benign word, but its practical implication is that we at the Federal level are demanding that we control the manner in which States develop their school systems—in a very precise way and in a way which creates a control system that is from the top down and that is focused on minutia, not on results.

The whole theme of the President's proposal, which was worked out and negotiated and passed out of committee 22-0, was that we would give flexibility to local school districts, flexibility to States to design programs that would address the needs of low-income kids specifically. And in exchange for that flexibility and the additional resources, we would expect results.

This amendment goes in the exact opposite direction. This says that in

exchange for a small amount of money, you, the States and local school districts, are going to have to do everything the same, have everything be comparable. Comparability doesn't really have that much relevance to quality, as we have seen over the years.

So I find this amendment to be probably one of the most intrusive amendments I have seen come forward on this bill. If it passes, it would have the practical effect, in my humble opinion, of fundamentally damaging this bill and changing the entire course of its purpose. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Connecticut for what I know will be a thoughtful question.

Mr. DODD. I want to pick up on this radical idea of equal opportunity of education. I know this is terribly radical—

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I didn't yield for a statement. I yielded for a question.

Mr. DODD. I want to get to the point of radicalness, which my friend raised as the hallmark behind this amendment. I address this to my colleague.

Under existing Federal law, the question is, Do we not require State standards for curricula that are the same for every child, and any child who brings a weapon to school—by the way, you lose Federal funds if you don't—is automatically expelled by Federal law, or you lose funds? In addition, an individual education plan is required for every child with a disability, or you lose Federal funds. There must be comparable educational services within the school districts, or you lose Federal funds. That has been on the books, by the way, since 1965. The word "comparable" is not synonymous with identical. We are trying to do comparable opportunities or comparable curricula to achieve equal opportunity. We are not breaking new ground. My question is with this since we do it already in five or six areas. We have identified one that goes back at least 36 years.

Mr. GREGG. I respond by saying that you are breaking new ground. The application of the word is the manner in which you break new ground. "Comparable" applied in one manner means one thing, but applied to another manner means something else. If you are applying "comparable" to a school system within a city, that is one thing. When you say "comparable" within an entire State, it is entirely different. Furthermore, if you are, specifically within the terms of comparable, defining what comparable means by saying class size, qualification of teachers, curriculum, range of courses offered, you are essentially setting up the standards in a very top-down, directive manner of what is going to happen in the school systems across the State. You are saying that they essentially all have to be the same.

Now, if we are talking about opportunity, what the underlying bill does is

create opportunity. That is the whole concept of this bill. This bill is dedicated to giving all the children in America—but especially the low-income child—the opportunity to succeed. We have now been through 25 or 35 years of an experiment in helping title I kids, and it has failed. One-hundred twenty-six billion dollars has been spent, and the average title I child is reading at two grade levels behind his or her peers. We know it hasn't worked.

So the President has said let's try a different approach, an approach focused on the child, giving that child an opportunity to learn.

That is exactly what this bill does. It says to the school systems: All right, we are going to give you flexibility, but in exchange we are going to expect success and we expect academic success equal to or better than what a child who doesn't come from a low-income family obtains. If you don't obtain that success, then there are sanctions. And there are accountability standards that are very aggressive to assure that we do obtain that success.

This bill supplies opportunity. I think to imply that it does anything else is to mischaracterize the bill. What this proposal does is essentially nationalize the system. It essentially says, from here on out, the Federal Government is going to be put in a position of saying that if every school district in a State isn't doing everything in a comparable way—I won't use it exactly, and you are right; they are not the same words—with class size, qualification of teachers, curriculum, range of courses offered, then we, the Federal Government, are going to stop sending you money and probably we have set up a lawsuit for you, the students, and the parents in those States.

You have to ask yourself, why is "comparable" better? What is better is to say we are going to give children a better chance to succeed, and we are going to find out if they are succeeding academically. That is what the bill does. Why is "comparable" better? Is it comparable to have the same number of Spanish teachers in Nashua, NH, and in Berlin, NH? Maybe Berlin doesn't need second language teachers and Nashua, NH, does. Is it better to have a comparable number of technical teachers in the area of some local industry, where the kids are being trained to be able to participate in one part of the State or another part of the State, when maybe their industries are not the same?

Comparability doesn't lead to quality. What it leads to is mediocrity. So I just say to my colleague from Connecticut that I understand the desire to produce quality education. I think the way you get there is by focusing child by child, not by taking a broad brush and applying it to the entire universe of education and saying the Fed-

eral Government is going to tell you how to do it.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know there are a number of Senators we have danced around today trying to figure out a time to vote. Prior to this unanimous consent agreement, which will require beginning 5 minutes of discussion at 5:10, the Senator from Delaware, Mr. BIDEN, wishes to speak for about 15 minutes of the approximately 30 minutes that we have on this Dodd amendment.

With that in mind, I ask unanimous consent that at 5:10 p.m. the Senate resume consideration of Bingaman amendment No. 791, that the Bingaman amendment be modified to be a first-degree amendment, and that following 5 minutes of closing debate, equally divided in the usual form, the Senate vote in relation to the Bingaman amendment at 5:15.

Further, following disposition of the Bingaman amendment, there be 4 minutes of debate divided in the usual form on the Voinovich amendment No. 389, as modified, followed by a vote in relation to the Voinovich amendment.

Further, that no second-degree amendments be in order to these amendments. I say to everybody within the sound of my voice that we will have two votes, first at 5:15, and the other following that.

Mr. GREGG. Reserving the right to object, did the Democratic assistant leader decide he didn't want to do the Reed amendment?

Mr. REID. Yes. We are going to try in the morning to dispose of the Dodd and Reed amendments.

We are unable to do that because of the lateness of the hour.

Mr. GREGG. I have no objection.

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe I reserved the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I understand the Senator from Delaware wishes to speak. I will not go much further, but only to say, for what it is worth, relative to this education bill, it appears to me we have wandered into an extremely difficult situation. This amendment is, in my humble opinion, a significant blow to the underlying purposes of the bill which have been worked through involving a lot of compromise and a lot of effort. Obviously, we are not going to vote on it tonight. I am hopeful it will be reconsidered before any time we even consider voting on it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for allowing me the opportunity to speak to this amendment.

With all due respect, I think the arguments of the Senator from New Hampshire would be better reserved for the New Hampshire Supreme Court than for the U.S. Senate. We are not nationalizing anything. There is nothing in the Dodd-Biden amendment that requires a national standard. We do require a State standard.

My friend says this bill is all about flexibility. It reminds me of a track meet. The rich kids can have brandnew track shoes and starting blocks for running the 100-meter race, and the poor kids can have flexibility. They can decide to run in long pants or short pants. They can decide whether or not they want to wear a sweat shirt or T-shirt. They can decide whether they want to run frontwards or backwards. They do not get track shoes and starting blocks, but they have flexibility. You can wear whatever color you want. You can wear long pants or short pants. You can run backwards or forwards. You can do cartwheels on the way down the track. But you do not get those spikes. You do not get those starting blocks. Guess what. You get judged. You get judged where you finish, and if you do not finish 1, 2, or 3, you are out.

That is the track standard set. The NCAA of track says: Hey, here's the deal. If you don't finish 1, 2, or 3, go home. You don't get to run anymore. You don't get to go on to the next step. But we gave you flexibility, all the flexibility you want, man. You could have done this with a dashiki on or you could have done this with a T-shirt on. You could have done this in a suit, or you could have done this in short pants. You have flexibility.

Not only flexibility matters. Maybe I have been doing this criminal justice stuff too long. I realize I do not know as much as my friend from Connecticut does about education, nor my friend from New Hampshire, whom I do not know as well, but I know my friend from Connecticut knows so much more. He has made a career of knowing this. I have made a career of understanding the criminal justice system—how you deal with crime, stop crime, affect it, and so on.

After all the years I have done it, it comes down to a few basic facts. If there are four corners, three cops on one corner, no cop on another, and there is going to be a crime at the intersection, it will be committed where the cop is not.

We also know when you are engaged in armed robberies or engaged in purse snatching, you tend not to do that when you get to be 40 years old because it is hard as heck to jump over that chain link fence with the cops chasing you. As you get older, you slow down and tend to get less violent. We know that. What we ate for breakfast, where we were raised, how we related to our mothers, what our education was—we

have a lot of theories about how that impacts on crime, but we do not know.

What we do know about education is basic. We know if you get two kids of comparable talent or lacking in talent and you put them in a classroom with 70 kids and 1 teacher, they are not going to do as well as if you put them in a classroom with 3 kids and 1 teacher. We know the more focused the attention, the closer to one on one you can get, the product being the same, the better chance you have of succeeding.

We also know if you have books that are legible and available and every student has one—same students, same IQ, same background, same everything—the kids with the good books are going to do better than the kids with the bad books.

My Walter Mitty dream was to be a professional athlete. A phrase my coach used was: A good big man can always beat a good small man. A phrase in athletics is: A good fast woman can always beat a good slow woman. There are certain truisms.

Two kids with the same talent, whether they have a 90 IQ or 190 IQ, whether they are creative, not creative, put them in a large class with a comparable group of people, and they are not going to do as well as when you put them in a small class of a comparable group of people. If you put them in the same classroom with a good teacher versus a bad teacher, they are going to do better with a good teacher. There are basics.

What do we know about how education works? My friend says we are going to nationalize. What we are trying to do is what States are trying to do right now and what my State has already done. We are trying to do what title I now requires.

I am going to use the word “comparable” comparably. Right now, “comparable” is used in the statute that exists to say that if you get title I money, every school in that school district has to have a comparable educational system. That is all the Senator from Connecticut did.

Why did he do it? Why did I join him? Why did I ask him to do it? I was going to offer this amendment because my friend, CHAKA FATTAH, with whom I worked for a long time in the House of Representatives—I am not on the committee, so I went to my friend from Connecticut and said: I want to do this.

He said: I am already going to do it. Why did he decide to use that word “comparable”?

Guess what. My friend from the State of New Hampshire says he wants a national standard. We did not say we want a national standard. The President said he wanted a national standard. My friend from New Hampshire wants a national standard. They want to judge how fast every kid can run. They want to judge how fast every kid

can read. They want to judge how well every kid can write.

OK, fine, but do not do to those kids the same thing as my fictitious example on the track. Do not judge the kid who comes from a school district where they spend \$5,000 per pupil, with teachers who have their teaching certificate in the area in which they teach—do not judge them by the same standard that you are going to judge kids who have \$1,500 spent on them per pupil, who have a majority of teachers who are not certified in the area they teach, who teach in classrooms that are leaky, some of them unsafe, and without an adequate number of textbooks.

As my dad would say: Give me a break. I do not think the Federal Government can or should, or any government should, decide to equalize everything. As one former President said, life is unfair. Certain things Government cannot do.

The Government cannot dictate you to be 6 foot 2, if that is what you want, or 5 foot 9. The Government cannot dictate that everybody will have the voice of Barbra Streisand or some famous male singer—whoever the heck you like. Life is unfair.

I was born with no talent musically and maybe with nothing else. The Federal Government cannot say: You know what: Guaranteed, JOE BIDEN cannot do what he wants to do, be a flanker for the New York Giants. That is truly what I wanted to be. Life was unfair. At 6 foot 1, 155 pounds, I did not have the talent of Tommy McDonald who was that small and played for the Philadelphia Eagles in the sixties. They cannot fix that.

Let me tell you what we can fix. We have an obligation to fix the things we can fix. If you are going to hold a kid to a standard, darn it, give him an equal opportunity, at least in his own State. Give him a shot.

Do my colleagues know what this reminds me of? The first African American ever admitted to the bar in the State of Delaware was Louis L. Redding. He took the bar in 1928. There were 13 or 14 people who took the bar that year. Twelve took it in one room with one test, and Louis L. Redding took it in another. They gave him a completely different test. No one on this floor today would say that is fair. I don't think anybody would say that is fair.

In a public system with one school district, and I don't care whether the kid is black or white, whether the child is Hispanic or Asian, if the child is slow or smart, it is unfair to take a very bright white kid in a school district where they spend \$1,000 or \$2,000 less per pupil than the other school where the bright white kid gets \$2,000 more spent on him—that may be the difference between going to my State university and Harvard University—it is clearly not fair for the kid born into

the district that has no tax base, where the businesses have moved out, where the average home is one-fourth the value of the neighboring school district, and say: judge them by the same standard.

There is enough inequity built into life. I will never forget when I was a widowed father; it was the first time it came to me: why it is so incredibly important there is diversity on the floor, including women, with a woman's perspective. I found women to be no slower, no brighter, no less venal, no more generous, no less generous, than men. I know I will get in trouble for saying that, but it is true.

I used to not understand why we didn't hold the kid who came out of the ghetto accountable, the mother with two kids making, by today's standard, \$16,000 or \$18,000 a year. We hold her kids to the same standard that we hold a kid who comes from a family with a combined income of a couple hundred thousand bucks, living in a great area, and attending great schools. The government can't do anything about that. I wish life were fair.

I remember as a single father raising two kids. I was a Senator. My sisters helped me raise my kids; my mother was available; my brother moved in to live with me. I had great help, and I had trouble. It is the first time I thought about my secretary raising kids by herself. I thought, my Lord, what an inequity.

We are not asking the government to fix that. We are asking the government along the way to make it equal and give leave for when your child is sick and things such as that. But here government is mandating. Depending on where one stands is how one views things. My friend views this piece of legislation as intrusive, nationalization of the school system. I view this legislation as an unfunded mandate. We are mandating that every school in America meet a standard, every school in the State meet a minimum standard. We are mandating that. We are telling them if they don't, they don't get Federal money. I am oversimplifying in the interest of time.

If I said to my friend from New Hampshire, you have to mandate that every drinking water system in the State of New Hampshire meet a certain standard, he would be the first one, with his colleagues on the floor, screaming about unfunded mandates, unfunded mandates, setting health standards, setting environmental standards, and not giving us any money.

This is not an unfunded mandate? I don't get this. How is this not an unfunded mandate?

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIDEN. I yield.

Mrs. BOXER. First, I thank both of my colleagues, Senators DODD and BIDEN.

I will clarify a few of the key points. The Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. GREGG, said Senator DODD and Senator BIDEN were introducing an entirely new concept and throwing this bill away from the direction it was heading. Then the Senator from Delaware showed that the word "comparable," which Senator GREGG said was a new word in this debate, is already in the law, and we expect comparability within school districts or the States lose some of their Federal funding. Am I not correct on that point?

Mr. BIDEN. That is exactly correct. Reading from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Committee on Education in the Workforce, U.S. House of Representatives, page 54, under section 1120(c):

(c) COMPARABILITY OF SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Except as provided in paragraphs (4) and (5), a local educational agency may receive funds under this part only if State and local funds will be used in schools served under this part to provide services that, taken as a whole, are at least comparable to services in schools that are not receiving funds under this part.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield, since the Senator used my name?

Mrs. BOXER. I have another question.

Mr. BIDEN. I will yield after the Senator asks her next question.

Mrs. BOXER. What the Senator has established is that Senator GREGG's critique that the word "comparability" is, in fact, a new word and new concept, is not true? It is blatantly false?

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. BOXER. If I can follow up to finish, and taking it another step, it seems to me the current law is pretty darned tough, saying the districts lose all title I funding if we don't have this comparability within a school district.

I say to my two friends who have offered—

Mr. GREGG. I take it the Senator is not yielding?

Mr. BIDEN. I will be happy when she finishes the question to yield to you.

Mr. GREGG. Since my name has been addressed two times, inaccurately, I think it would be appropriate to yield.

Mrs. BOXER. If I could ask just this question, is it not a fact in your amendment what you are merely saying—frankly, I think it is a pretty weak excuse for being critical; it is a pretty modest amendment—the Senator is saying that the government has to send a letter indicating, in fact, that the kids are being treated pretty comparably, whether they are born in an urban area, rural area, or suburban area. Whatever area they are in, whatever they look like is immaterial, just that they are getting a comparable education. If the Government doesn't send such a letter, as I read this legislation, only 1 percent or so of administrative funds will be withheld because we want to hold the States accountable to each child. Am I correct in that synopsis?

Mr. BIDEN. The answer to the question is yes.

I am happy to yield to the Senator for a question without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. GREGG. I ask the Chair the situation relative to the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 10 minutes after 5 o'clock, 5 minutes will be equally divided, and that precedes a vote on the Bingaman amendment.

Mr. GREGG. I thought the Senator from Delaware had 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was not part of the formal agreement.

Mr. GREGG. I simply note that I believe it is the proper decorum of the Senate when a Senator's name is used, and especially when a Senator's position is misrepresented, for a Senator to yield.

Mr. BIDEN. I did yield.

Mr. GREGG. I appreciate that. Unfortunately, the Senator from California did not appear to be inclined to participate in that yielding.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I was asking a question. I said I would be happy to stop when I finished asking the second question. I didn't even have the floor. Senator BIDEN had the floor and was graciousness enough to yield to me to clarify some of the comments made against his amendment by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I will simply ask the Senator from Delaware a question. Is it not appropriate when a Senator uses a Senator's name and inaccurately characterizes a Senator's position, that Senator have an opportunity to respond?

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, this is getting kind of silly. If the Senator wants to respond, respond. I am delighted to yield to him to respond. There was no intention to in any way affront the Senator.

The Senator from California asked me a question. She did not have the floor; I had the floor; and I yielded to her for a question. You walked on the floor. As soon as she finished, I yielded to you because your name was mentioned.

Mr. GREGG. I am delighted that the Senator is yielding, but in accordance with the rules, I believe I must formulate my response in the form of a question.

Mr. BIDEN. I do not want to lose my right to the floor for the next 10 minutes. The Senator spoke for the last 25 minutes. I want to speak. Give me an idea. I will be happy to give you the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind the Senators they should address one another in the third person or through the Chair.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Delaware to yield 2 minutes.

Mr. BIDEN. I am delighted to do so, reserving my right to the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Reserving the right to the floor afterward.

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

Mr. GREGG. The Senator from California on two different occasions misrepresented my position on this floor. My position is that the term "comparable" exists in the law. In fact, I referred to that when I spoke with the Senator, when we exchanged discussion with the Senator from Connecticut.

I pointed out, however, in the terms it is used in the law as it presently exists, it is a much more confined word than the manner in which it is being applied in the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. Under the proposal of the Senator from Connecticut, he has taken the term "comparable" and expanded it in a manner which essentially amounts to the Federal Government taking over the ability of school systems across this country to be independent, to act in an independent way and to create a curriculum, class size ratio, and the operation of the regular day for the student in a manner that is independent and maintains local control.

That is the issue here, whether or not we are controlling from the top or whether we are controlling at the end. What the President has proposed is to bring all American students who are under title I up to a level of proficiency that is equal to or better than that of their peers, and to assure the accomplishment of that, to allow the local school districts the flexibility to accomplish that. But in the end, to expect that to be obtained by having the local student subject to a testing regime which shows the student has accomplished those goals. That is the purpose of the President's proposal.

The opposite is being accomplished, if this amendment is agreed to, which is basically to have the Federal Government come in and control the input of the school day, school curriculum and the classes.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Delaware for allowing me to respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from New Hampshire was not here when I was speaking. If you give me just a second, in case his name comes up again so he understands the context in which I used his name, the Senator says—which is, on its face, a sound argument—that "comparable" may not in fact be comparable. We are using the language, in our amendment, "comparable," which is, on line 5 of page 1 of the amendment, in "comparability of services." We are using the words "comparability of services" in a comparable comparison. That is, it is the exact language used in the existing law relating to title I, which says "comparability of services" in Section 1120A subsection c.

The second point I would like to make to my friend is that we are not nationalizing anything. Let's understand what this does. Right now, if Houston or North Carolina has a charter school, that charter school has to have comparable services that exist within that school district, or they could not have the school. It could not be a public school. So all we are saying is you should do—and I apologize for saying this—what we do in Delaware.

In Delaware, the State funds 70 percent of the funding of every school district, every school in the State. Not just the district, every school in the State. We have comparable funding, comparable education, required by our law. It is not unlike what the Supreme Court in the State of New Hampshire said, in the decision I have in my hand, if I am reading it correctly, saying that your Supreme Court dictated—they didn't use the word "comparable," but dictated that there be "essentially equal services."

So there is nothing new about this. I view this as an unfunded mandate. You view it as national intrusion. If you are going to insist on a testing regime which I think does not make a lot of sense, and force my State to have to comply in order to get any Federal funds, then it seems to me I have a right to say you are dictating an unfunded mandate because you are requiring some of the kids in the States in this country, where 20, 30, 40, 50 percent less is spent and where 70 percent of their teachers are not certified in the area for which they teach, in classrooms which leak, in buildings which are in some cases a trap, and say to them we are going to hold you to the same standard or your State is not going to get money. That is an unfunded mandate to me. To me, that is an unfunded mandate.

All we are saying is, as we did when we talked about title I, you are mandating to a State what they have to do. I am saying: OK, mandate to the State but fund it. Fund it. Make it fair.

Again, I realize time is getting close here for our vote. I am going to have to yield the floor, not my right to the floor but yield for the vote. It seems to me, if you take a look at the facts, what we are talking about here is just simple, basic fairness. If you take two children from the same background, same intellectual capability, same amount of gray matter, same everything, and you give one kid less attention, you give one kid books that are not as good, you have one kid taught by an inferior teacher and one by a good teacher, those two comparable kids will end up scoring differently. They will score differently on the test.

They may both pass it. They may both do extremely well. But the one with the better teacher, the one who had more attention lavished on him, the one with the better materials, the

one in the safer environment, is almost surely going to score better.

So it seems to me all we are talking about is simple fairness. I view this as a value issue. The Senator from New Hampshire and I have a different value system on this issue. I respect his. He is not wrong. He just has a different value system than I do. I value the notion that all children, if they are held to the same standard, should have the same opportunity. If the Government is going to impose a standard, then the Government should see that they have the same opportunity. That is a basic value I have.

He thinks the value of the State schools being able to have one group of kids in one school where they have lousy teachers, where they have lousy buildings, where they have little money spent on them compared to another, that what he values most is the right of the State to do that. I respect that. I respect that. I disagree with it. We have a different value system. This is the debate about values.

Parliamentary inquiry. When is the Senator from Delaware to cease so we can begin the next vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 35 seconds.

Mr. BIDEN. Parliamentary inquiry. After the two votes, does the Senator from Delaware retain the floor on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not automatically.

Mr. BIDEN. I will not ask unanimous consent to do that, but I will be around to continue this debate. I thank my friend from New Hampshire for whom I have great respect. We just have a different value system about education.

AMENDMENT NO. 791, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). There are now 5 minutes evenly divided before the vote with respect to the Bingaman amendment.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. As I understand it, following the vote on the Bingaman amendment, the next item of business is the vote on the Voinovich amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me describe to the other Senators what the choice is on these two amendments. I have offered the amendment on behalf of myself, Senator HATCH, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that all of those Senators be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. The amendment I am offering makes it clear that Governors should be consulted with regard to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act plans which are involved in this legislation but that the Congress

is not going to override the provisions States have adopted in their constitutions and in their statutes for organizing and administering their educational programs.

The Voinovich amendment—which is the second vote—in my view, is objectionable because it will give a veto to the Governor over any State plan for the expenditure of the Federal funds in that State. My State does not allow the Governor a veto. It has a provision for the Governor to appoint five members of our State school board—to be involved in that way. But the State school board has the responsibility under our constitution.

I want to see to it that Congress does not try to override my State's constitution and the constitutions and statutes of quite a few States which have their own ways of administering their educational programs.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that, again, I am offering on behalf of myself, Senator HATCH, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator DOMENICI. I believe this will preserve the existing arrangement we have between the Federal Government and the States. It will allow the States to exercise their sovereign right to determine how they will administer their educational programs.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. And when the time comes, I or Senator KENNEDY or somebody will urge that the Voinovich amendment not be adopted, which is the vote following this vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Ohio, Mr. VOINOVICH, is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, the Senate has before it two approaches to giving the Governors of our respective States an opportunity to participate in having some input in the plan that a State submits to the Secretary of Education as to what will be done with the Federal money under ESEA.

When I originally offered my amendment, there was some concern on the part of my colleagues that this amendment might violate State law or the constitutions of the States. Earlier today I modified our amendment to provide that the signature of the Governor would not be required on the application to the Department of Education in the event there was a State constitution or State law that prevented it.

It has been argued by the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Massachusetts, that this legislation would be a veto on the part of the Governors of the States over the wishes of the State superintendents of education. I think that by requiring the signature of the Governor, as contrasted to consultation, you are going to have a situation where you enhance

the application because it will force the Governor and the chief State superintendent to work together in promoting the plan for the spending of that money. In too many States, the Governors and the State superintendents of education do not speak to each other on such matters.

When we came up with ESEA in 1965, the Governors were not as involved as they are today. But, I say to my colleagues, if you go to your State and ask your citizens, do you believe that the Governor of your State signs the application to the Secretary of Education for Federal money? the answer 95 percent of the time will probably be yes and they would be wrong, even though the Governors are being held responsible for education.

All we are saying is, rather than taking the approach as suggested by Senator BINGAMAN and Senator KENNEDY, rather than consulting, we require that the Governor's signature be on that application. Most of us know that if we have to consult with somebody, and they know our signature isn't necessary, there "ain't" much consultation that takes place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 791, as modified, offered by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Leg.]

YEAS—59

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Akaka | Daschle | Leahy |
| Baucus | Dayton | Levin |
| Bennett | Dodd | Lincoln |
| Biden | Domenici | Lugar |
| Bingaman | Dorgan | Mikulski |
| Bond | Durbin | Murray |
| Boxer | Edwards | Nelson (FL) |
| Breaux | Ensign | Reed |
| Brownback | Feingold | Reid |
| Bunning | Feinstein | Rockefeller |
| Burns | Graham | Sarbanes |
| Byrd | Harkin | Schumer |
| Cantwell | Hollings | Smith (OR) |
| Carnahan | Inouye | Stabenow |
| Chafee | Jeffords | Thompson |
| Clinton | Johnson | Thurmond |
| Cochran | Kennedy | Torricelli |
| Collins | Kerry | Wellstone |
| Conrad | Kohl | Wyden |
| Corzine | Landrieu | |

NAYS—39

| | | |
|------------|------------|-------------|
| Allard | Gregg | Nelson (NE) |
| Allen | Hagel | Nickles |
| Bayh | Helms | Roberts |
| Campbell | Hutchinson | Santorum |
| Carper | Hutchison | Sessions |
| Cleland | Inhofe | Shelby |
| Craig | Kyl | Smith (NH) |
| DeWine | Lieberman | Snowe |
| Enzi | Lott | Specter |
| Fitzgerald | McCain | Stevens |
| Frist | McConnell | Thomas |
| Gramm | Miller | Voinovich |
| Grassley | Murkowski | Warner |

NOT VOTING—2

Crapo Hatch

The amendment (No. 791), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 389, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 4 minutes evenly divided under the Voinovich amendment No. 389, as modified. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, the Voinovich-Bayh amendment fundamentally requires the Governors of the 50 States to sign the application that is submitted to the Secretary of Education for the expenditure of funds under the ESEA. It is in contrast with the Bingaman amendment that was just adopted which says consultation should take place with the Governor rather than having the Governor's signature.

I argue there is not much consultation that will take place unless a Governor's signature is also required on that application.

Most Senators know that the Governors of the 50 States are the ones who are held responsible for the education programs in their States. Our amendment recognizes some State constitutions and laws preclude participation by the Governor, and we exempt any State with a constitution or law which does not allow the Governor to participate.

This amendment is supported by the bipartisan National Governors' Association unanimously. They have asked for it because they believe consensus on education in the States is needed. It will make it easier to leverage State resources, and it also will provide more accountability.

I yield the remainder of my time to Senator BAYH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 25 seconds.

Mr. BAYH. Twenty-five seconds, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. BAYH. I need to be briefer than normal.

I support this amendment for the practical reason that States will continue to pay for 94 percent of State and

local education expenditures. If we are going to make the progress we need to make for America's schoolchildren, we need States leading the way along with the Federal Government. That means Governors cooperating and leading the way. I have never seen a major State education reform effort enacted without the aid and assistance of the Governor.

This amendment will require the Governor and chief State school officer to work together. We need that to make this reform work.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I must oppose the amendment to S. 1, the BEST Act, offered by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. VOINOVICH.

This amendment would require the State educational agencies, SEAs, to "jointly prepare a plan to carry out the responsibilities of the State . . . including carrying out the State educational agency's statewide system of technical assistance and support for local educational agencies." This would clearly supercede the Wisconsin State Constitution.

Article X, Section 1 of the Wisconsin Constitution states: "The supervision of public instruction shall be vested in a state superintendent and other officers as the legislature shall direct; and their qualifications, powers, duties and compensation shall be prescribed in law. The state superintendent shall be chosen by the qualified electors of the state at the same time and in the same manner as member of the supreme court, and shall hold office for 4 years. . . ."

The Federal Government should not supersede the Wisconsin Constitution by requiring the duly elected Superintendent of Public Instruction to have the Governor sign off on proposals submitted to the federal Department of Education.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, which would provide for coordination between the SEA and the Governor without infringing on the independence of the SEA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, those who voted for the last amendment which I offered on behalf of myself, Senator HATCH, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator DOMENICI, voted to allow States to continue to make the decision as to how they administer their education programs and their education funds. In my view, that is the appropriate position for us to take in the Senate.

The amendment the Senator from Ohio is now offering would, in fact, give the Governors a veto over any State plan, regardless of whether that

is the way a State has decided to administer their State educational funds. It would totally override the State constitution in my State. It would override the State constitution in many States. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield the rest of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio said the Governors support his amendment. All the State, local, and county officials support the Bingaman provisions. We are saying if the State has made the decision to let the Governor run education, then they ought to be the ones to make that decision. If the State makes the decision to let the State educational agency make that decision, the Bingaman amendment also makes that decision but permits the Governor to be consulted.

Talk about States rights. We are letting the States make the decision who is going to make the judgment. The Voinovich amendment overrides any State decision that says they are going to let the State agency do it and insists the Governor do it. We have not had a hearing on it. Naturally, the Governors are for it, but the State and local educators are strongly opposed to it.

The Bingaman amendment permits consultations. That is the way we ought to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 389, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. STABENOW). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—40

| | | |
|------------|-------------|------------|
| Allard | Gregg | Nickles |
| Allen | Hagel | Santorum |
| Bayh | Helms | Sessions |
| Bennett | Hutchinson | Shelby |
| Carnahan | Hutchison | Smith (NH) |
| Carper | Inhofe | Snowe |
| Cleland | Kyl | Specter |
| Collins | Lieberman | Stevens |
| Craig | Lott | Thompson |
| DeWine | McCain | Thurmond |
| Fitzgerald | McConnell | Voinovich |
| Frist | Miller | Warner |
| Gramm | Murkowski | |
| Grassley | Nelson (NE) | |

NAYS—58

| | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|
| Akaka | Burns | Daschle |
| Baucus | Byrd | Dayton |
| Biden | Campbell | Dodd |
| Bingaman | Cantwell | Domenici |
| Bond | Chafee | Dorgan |
| Boxer | Clinton | Durbin |
| Breaux | Cochran | Edwards |
| Brownback | Conrad | Ensign |
| Bunning | Corzine | Enzi |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Feingold | Landrieu | Rockefeller |
| Feinstein | Leahy | Sarbanes |
| Graham | Levin | Schumer |
| Harkin | Lincoln | Smith (OR) |
| Hollings | Lugar | Stabenow |
| Inouye | Mikulski | Thomas |
| Jeffords | Murray | Torricelli |
| Johnson | Nelson (FL) | Wellstone |
| Kennedy | Reed | Wyden |
| Kerry | Reid | |
| Kohl | Roberts | |

NOT VOTING—2

Crapo Hatch

The amendment (No. 389), as modified, was rejected.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have conferred with the manager of the bill, Senator GREGG. I ask unanimous consent when the Senate resumes consideration of S.1, the ESEA bill, on Thursday, June 7, that there be an hour for debate with respect to the Dodd amendment No. 459, controlled between Senators DODD and GREGG; that upon the use or yielding back of that time the amendment be set aside and the Nelson-Carnahan amendment No. 385 become the pending business, with 45 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form with no second-degree amendments in order thereto, with a vote occurring upon the use or yielding back of time.

I further ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the Nelson-Carnahan amendment No. 385, Senator SMITH of New Hampshire be recognized to call up amendment No. 487; that there be 40 minutes for debate with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form, and that no second-degree amendments be in order, with a vote occurring upon the use or yielding back of the time.

Finally, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the Smith amendment, Senator WELLSTONE be recognized to call up amendment No. 466, with 4 hours for debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form, with no second-degree amendments in order thereto, and that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote on that amendment.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following the statement of the Senator from Connecticut in relation to this bill, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 459

Mr. DODD. Just to inform my colleagues, and the managers of the bill,

my intention is to take about 6 or 7 minutes to discuss the Dodd amendment, and then there will be time tomorrow, obviously, to go into this a bit further.

I do not know if any agreement has been reached on when we can vote on this amendment. I have no intention of delaying action on this legislation. I do not know if my colleague from Massachusetts or my colleague from New Hampshire would like to agree on a time, but we can vote on the Dodd amendment at a time that is convenient for the managers of this bill.

I know there are other amendments that need to be considered. My desire is to get to a vote and not to delay consideration of the bill.

But let me go back a bit, if I may, and try to make clear that my good friend—he is a wonderful friend, and there are very few Members on either side of the aisle whose intelligence I respect more than the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. JUDG GREGG. He is extremely bright, knowledgeable, and cares a lot about these issues.

He suggested that my amendment is one of the most intrusive suggestions by the Federal Government in the area of elementary and secondary education in maybe the history of mankind, I guess. He is nodding in the affirmative, so I guess he probably agrees with that statement of mine.

Mr. GREGG. That is close.

Mr. DODD. This is anything but that. If you had to apply one word to the underlying proposal, if you had to pick out one word in the English language that is supposed to be the hallmark of this Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I would suggest the word would be “accountability.” That is the one word we have heard repeated over and over and over again.

This bill, if adopted, will require accountability of students because we will mandate a Federal test at the local level. It is Uncle Sam, the Federal Government, mandating a Federal test, a Federal standard. So accountability can be achieved at the student level.

We demand accountability of the local school districts. And if those districts do not achieve a level of achievement or performance, then there is the danger of losing Federal dollars.

We demand accountability of teachers in this bill. We are insisting upon certain standards of performance, Uncle Sam saying that teachers at the local level must perform at a certain level.

In a sense, we are demanding accountability of parents by insisting that their children do better and that parents be involved.

My point simply is this: We are demanding accountability of children, of parents, of teachers, of local school boards, of mayors, of schools themselves, and ourselves in a sense, but the

one entity that escapes any accountability at all is States.

I know States are wrestling with this issue. But requiring comparable efforts to achieve equal opportunity of education is not a radical idea. If we are demanding that an eighth grade or third grade student pass a test, should a Governor of a State or a school board or some entity at the State level escape any less accountability of whether or not our States are doing what is necessary for our schools and our schoolchildren to do better?

So that is what this amendment does. It says, look, after 4 or 5 years, we want to know that States are insisting upon a comparable—not identical—comparable educational opportunity in schools. The word “comparable” is carefully selected. The word is 36 years old in the context of education. In 1965, we said there must be comparable educational opportunity within school districts.

I come from a State of 31/2 million people. There are school districts in this country that have more children than in all of my State: Los Angeles, Houston, New York. I do not know about Detroit, the major city of the Presiding Officer, but there are school districts in this country that have more children in them than exist in many of our States, where we have mandated, for 36 years, comparable educational opportunity.

Is it such a quantum leap to say that States ought to provide comparable educational opportunity at the State level? We are demanding it of kids. We are demanding it of districts. Shouldn't our States meet a similar standard? That is all we are doing with this amendment. And if they fail to do so, the penalty is to be determined by the Secretary of Education, which would only involve administrative funds.

This is not some sword of Damocles hanging over students. We are not cutting off title I funding. We are saying, if you do not meet these standards, then the Federal Government will not provide administrative funds. We leave that up to the Secretary to determine the extent of that penalty.

My colleague from New Hampshire is no longer in the Chamber, but I want to read a statement, if I may, that sort of explains what I am trying to do. This statement reads as follows:

There is nothing fair or just about taxing a home or other real estate in one town at four times the rate that similar property is taxed in another town to fulfill the same purpose of meeting the State's educational duty. Compelling taxpayers from property-poor districts to pay higher tax rates and thereby contribute disproportionate sums to fund education is unreasonable. Children who live in poor and rich districts have the same right to a constitutionally adequate public education.

That radical statement is from a decision by the Supreme Court of the State of New Hampshire. The Supreme

Court of the State of New Hampshire is saying property taxpayers in that State ought not to be disproportionately burdened, rich versus poor, to provide an equal opportunity for education. That is all this amendment is saying.

It does not federalize education. It does not say to New Hampshire or to Connecticut or to Michigan how you ought to do this. It just says: Do it any way you wish. You decide what comparable educational opportunity ought to be. But whatever it is in your respective States, then it ought to be available to every child in that State whether they live in a rich town or a poor town. That is all this says.

Madam President, I refer my colleagues to the New Hampshire Supreme Court case at 123 Ed. Law Rep. 233.

The New Hampshire Supreme Court decision says it better than I could, that you should not ask towns of disparate wealth to have their children get a disparate educational opportunity. That is not any great leap of logic. In a sense, this idea that the Federal Government is all of a sudden reaching into our States or our local districts at a level unprecedented in the history of our country is to deny the reality. Since 1965, we have said: Comparable educational opportunity in school districts. We have said: If a child brings a gun to school and is not automatically expelled, we cut off your Federal money in local communities.

We have said that an individual education plan for every child with a disability must be in place. That is the Federal Government mandating that. If you don't, we cut off all your money. Comparable educational services within the district goes back to 1965. There must be State standards for curricula that are the same for every child or you lose Federal funds.

This is already the law of the land. I am just suggesting that the States must submit these plans and take steps to implement them. And I do it over the next 6 years, by the way, the life of this bill, the same period of time we are going to be testing every child in America based on this bill. We are going to test apparently every teacher based on this bill. We are going to threaten title I funds to local districts under this bill. We are threatening parents with untold problems if we cut off funds to rural and urban schools and there is no other alternative for them.

We are asking of everybody in the country to be more responsible. I would like to add States to that list of political entities and individuals from whom we are seeking a higher degree of responsibility. Call that radical if you will. I don't think it is. Why should they get by? Why do the States or the Governors get a pass on this? If you are going to test a kid, why not test a Governor or a State? If you are going to test a teacher, why not test whether or

not a State is doing its best to provide comparable educational opportunity?

Many States are trying. Regrettably, some are not. The Governors and the State authorities across this country know of whom I speak with this amendment. If we are saying to some school districts that many feel are not doing an adequate job—and there are many who have told anecdotal stories throughout the debate on this bill about school districts that are failing to meet their responsibilities; I accept that as the truth. There are school districts not doing what they ought to be doing when it comes to children's educational opportunities. I accept the fact there are teachers out there who are not teaching very well and superintendents and school boards that are failing in their responsibilities and parents who are as well.

If all of that is true, don't stand there and tell me that every State is meeting its obligations because they are not. This amendment merely says they ought to. If this bill is going to be fair to everybody, if 94 cents of the education dollar comes from local property-tax payers or State funds and only 6 cents from the Federal Government, and if we are demanding a standard of ourselves on 6 cents, then we ought to demand at least some accountability from our States with the 94 cents they are responsible for when it comes to educational needs at the elementary and secondary level.

As I said a moment ago, many States are doing their best. They are achieving comparable educational opportunity. This is not identical. I am using the words that have been on the books dealing with education issues since 1965. Comparable educational opportunity must exist within school districts. There are school districts that have student populations in their districts which exceed the student populations of most States.

If we demand accountability of school districts numbering hundreds of thousands of kids—that comparability, not identical, comparable—why not ask the States to do that? They lecture us all the time. I have listened to Governors tell us about one problem after another concerning what needs to be done. Is this somehow an immune class from consideration? I don't think so.

This amendment is reasonable. It is not excessive. If we are asking accountability, if that is the mantra on this bill, accountability for everybody—and I agree with that; it is overdue—then States ought to also get in line when it comes to taking that test that we are going to demand of everybody. Over the next 6 years, let everybody become more responsible. Let everybody become more accountable—every child, parent, teacher, school board, superintendent, principal, and, yes, Governor and State as well.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask consent that the time for debate on the Nelson-Carnahan amendment No. 385 be increased from 45 minutes to 60 minutes.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. With this consent, the first rollcall vote in the morning will occur at approximately 11:30.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 603, AS FURTHER MODIFIED, AND 517, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments numbered 603 and 517, as previously agreed to, be modified further to conform to the substitute amendment. This has the approval of the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments are so modified.

The amendments (Nos. 603 and 517), as modified, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 603

On page 506, lines 2 and 3, strike “and other public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations” and insert “and public and private entities”

On page 506, line 9, strike “nonprofit organizations” and insert “entities”.

On page 525, lines 18 and 19, strike “and other public entities and private nonprofit organizations” and insert “and public and private entities”.

On page 548, lines 24 and 25, strike “nonprofit organizations” and insert “entities”.

On page 554, lines 18 and 19, strike “nonprofit private organizations” and insert “private entities”.

AMENDMENT NO. 517

On page 309, lines 17 and 18, strike “subsection (f)” and insert “subsections (b), (e) and (f)”.

On page 339, line 6, strike “(b)” and insert “(c)”.

On page 339, strike lines 7 through 16 and insert the following:

“(b) SCHOOL LEADERSHIP.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—

“(A) HIGH-NEED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ‘high-need local educational agency’ means a local educational agency for which more than 30 percent of the students served by the local educational agency are students in poverty.

“(B) POVERTY LINE.—The term ‘poverty line’ means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

“(C) STUDENT IN POVERTY.—The term ‘student in poverty’ means a student from a family with an income below the poverty line.

“(2) PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a national principal recruitment program.

“(3) GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the program, the Secretary shall make grants, on a competitive basis, to high-need local educational agencies that seek to recruit and train principals (including assistant principals).

“(B) USE OF FUNDS.—An agency that receives a grant under subparagraph (A) may use the funds made available through the grant to carry out principal recruitment and training activities that may include—

“(i) providing stipends for master principals who mentor new principals;

“(ii) using funds innovatively to recruit new principals, including recruiting the principals by providing pay incentives or bonuses;

“(iii) developing career mentorship and professional development ladders for teachers who want to become principals; and

“(iv) developing incentives, and professional development and instructional leadership training programs, to attract individuals from other fields, including business and law, to serve as principals.

“(C) APPLICATION AND PLAN.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, a local educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require. The application shall include—

“(i) a needs assessment concerning the shortage of qualified principals in the school district involved and an assessment of the potential for recruiting and retaining prospective and aspiring leaders, including teachers who are interested in becoming principals; and

“(ii) a comprehensive plan for recruitment and training of principals, including plans for mentorship programs, ongoing professional development, and instructional leadership training, for high-need schools served by the agency.

“(D) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this subsection, the Secretary shall give priority to local educational agencies that demonstrate that the agencies will carry out the activities described in subparagraph (B) in partnership with nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education.

“(E) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds appropriated to carry out this subsection shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds expended to provide principal recruitment and retention activities.

“(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and each subsequent fiscal year.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, am I subject to morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are now in morning business.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 15 minutes in response to the Senator from Connecticut.

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

AN EQUAL APPROACH TO EDUCATION

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his very generous comments relative to my role in the Senate. I reciprocate. I admire the Senator from Connecticut immensely. I enjoy him as a colleague, especially his sense of humor and his ability to fashion thoughtful policy with which I sometimes agree and sometimes disagree. It